DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 295 95 SO 009 757

AUTHOR McDavid, James C.; Allen, David N.
TITLE Perceived Opportunities for Improving Productivity in the Harrisburg Bureau of Police.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Inst. of Public Administration.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 557AH50165
PUB DATE Aug 76
GRANT G00-75-02104
NOTE 161p.; For a related document, see SO 009 756

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; City Government; Community Attitudes; *Community Programs; *Community Services; Decision Making; Efficiency; Job Training; Law Enforcement; *Police; Police Action; Police Community Relationship; *Productivity; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Promotion (Occupational); Social Science Research; Surveys; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This report, summarizing the results of a survey of the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Bureau of Police, focuses on perceived opportunities for productivity improvements in the Bureau as viewed by police officers themselves. The study looks at definite change strategy suggestions and the attitudinal climate influencing any potential changes. A survey questionnaire was administered to 52 officers from November 1975 through January 1976. All respondents were male, 15 lived in Harrisburg, and three were black. Questions were related to police perceptions of productivity and of effects of specific changes. The most consistent productivity finding was a high level of concern about the need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy. On a scale of 1 to 10, this factor was rated 8.5. Other attitude findings include (1) more basic and inservice training, but not higher education, was related to high productivity; (2) need for better equipment and more concentration on crime rather than community service was rated high; (3) 95% of respondents linked reduction in noncriminal services to better police effectiveness; (4) patrol-related, especially foot patrol, activity was not ranked high; (5) 75% of respondents felt negative toward one-man patrol cars; and (6) foot patrol and increased patrol time were viewed as high priority of residents. The questionnaire and 32 tables of response data are contained in the document. (ND)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133295

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IPA

PERCEIVED OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY IN THE HARRISBURG BUREAU OF POLICE

SP 009 757

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
211 BURROWES BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA 16802

PERCEIVED OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY IN THE HARRISBURG BUREAU OF POLICE

by

James C. McDavid

and

David N. Allen

Institute of Public Administration
The Pennsylvania State University

August, 1976

The survey upon which this report is based and the preparation of the report was made possible by the "City Hall/University Application of Urban Research and Decision Technology through Continuing Education" Project, funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Grant No. G00-75-02104, Project No. 557AH50165, Robert J. Mowitz, Project Director. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

FOREWORD

The survey and analysis of perceptions and attitudes towards opportunity for improved productivity in the Harrisburg Bureau of Police that is reported herein is part of a larger project, "City Hall/University Application of Urban Research and Decision Technology through Continuing Education," funded by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Grant No. G00-75-02104. The project involves working with four cities — Harrisburg, York, and Wilkes-Barre in Pennsylvania and Bridgeport, Connecticut — in the development of urban technology leading to an integrated system of program budgeting, program analysis, and productivity improvement in each of the cities. The present study focuses upon one aspect of productivity improvement — suggestions from public employees and officials concerning ways in which productivity can be enhanced. Obviously, there are many other dimensions to productivity analysis such as work-flow analysis, development of work standards, assignment strategy, and so forth; but regardless of the analytic approach employed, in the last analysis, employee motivation will be an important variable influencing success in implementing change. This study, therefore, provides not only significant substantive suggestions on the part of the police force related to productivity but also provides insight into the attitudinal climate that will influence any potential changes that might be introduced.

In addition to Messrs. McDavid and Allen, who have coauthored the report, the contribution of Charles DeBrunner, who participated in the interviewing and analysis of the data in his capacity as research assistant, should also be acknowledged. Special thanks are also due to Mary Long, who did the typing and assisted in the copy editing of the report. Also, I should like to acknowledge the cooperation which was received from the Harrisburg Department of Public Safety and the Bureau of Police. Finally, I should also like to acknowledge the continuing support of Mayor Swenson, which has made possible our project in its many dimensions with the City of Harrisburg.

Robert J. Mowitz
Director

August 13, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	ii
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	v
Purpose of the Report	v
Findings	v
Uses of the Survey Findings	viii
THE ISSUE OF POLICE PRODUCTIVITY	1
Background	1
Defining Police Productivity	2
Defining Police Effectiveness	5
PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS RELATED TO POLICE PRODUCTIVITY	6
The Findings	6
Overall Rankings of Factors for Improving Police Productivity	8
Productivity Factors Rated as Having the Highest Potential for Improving Police Productivity	9
Productivity Factors Rated as Having the Lowest Potential for Improving Police Productivity	16
Additional Factors with Potential for Improving Police Productivity	22
Productivity Factors that Police Officers Perceived as Important to Harrisburg Residents	31

Page

OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF TWO ALTERNATE PATROL STRATEGIES AND AN ALTERNATE SERVICE-PROVISION STRATEGY 37

Findings for the Entire Sample 37

The Effects of Having a Street or Administrative Assignment on Responses to the Three Questions 45

The Effects of Number of Years on the Force on Responses to the Three Questions 50

The Effects of Officer Rank on Responses to the Three Questions 56

The Effects of Education on Responses to the Three Questions 60

Comparisons among Officers with Different Training Levels . . 65

Comparisons between Officers Who Lived or Did Not Live in Harrisburg 67

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 74

Factors Related to Improving Police Productivity 74

The Effects of Respondent Characteristics on Perceptions of Productivity Factors 78

Officers' Perceptions of How Citizens Would Rate Productivity Factors 81

Uses of the Survey Findings 82

APPENDIX A 84

APPENDIX B 88

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Purpose of the Report

This report summarizes the results of a survey conducted by the Institute of Public Administration in the Harrisburg Bureau of Police. Specifically, the report focuses mainly on perceived opportunities for productivity improvements in the Bureau, as viewed by police officers themselves.

The findings reported here constitute summaries of the responses of 52 police officers to a series of questions related to police productivity and several others related to the effects of specific changes in service-provision strategies. As such, they reflect the opinions of nearly one third of the sworn personnel in the Bureau. The findings can be interpreted as indicators of important concerns of Harrisburg police officers. Thus, they afford City officials with a perspective on the organization that is useful in making decisions about future Bureau policies.

Findings

1. Perhaps the most consistent finding from this survey of the Harrisburg Police Bureau was the high level of concern expressed by officers over the need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy. On a scale from 1 to 10, this factor received an average rating of 8.5 for all officers interviewed. When the sample was broken into different groups of officers, this factor continued to dominate the rankings of all 21 factors presented to each person in the sample.

2. Another important finding was that two high productivity factors related to improved training. "More in-service training for officers" and "More basic training for new recruits" were rated highly by the overall sample and by most groups of officers within the sample. At the same time, however, the factor related to obtaining more formal education, "Taking college courses towards an Associate or Bachelor's Degree," was not rated highly by the officers in the sample.

3. Two other factors among the 21 presented to all officers received relatively high average ratings. "Better equipment," e.g., radio scramblers, was given an average rating of 7.7 by all officers in the sample; and "Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual services to citizens" was given an even higher average rating--7.8 on a 10-point scale.

4. At a different point in the questionnaire, officers were asked what impacts on police effectiveness a reduction in services related to noncriminal public order would have. Eighty-five percent of the sample indicated that such a change would increase their effectiveness, a finding which suggests that officers link their effectiveness to crime-related activities.

5. Another set of findings that are important relates to the patrol function of the Police Bureau. In general, the officers that were interviewed did not rank patrol-related productivity factors highly. The exception, "Increasing the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments," was rated among the top 5 factors by officers with street assignments, officers with the highest level of training, and officers with the highest level of education. The only other patrol-related factor that was ranked highly by any group of

officers was "Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars," ranked among the top 5 factors by officers with the highest level of education.

6. On the other hand, "Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols" was rated among the lowest 5 factors by several groups of officers: patrolmen, officers with a street assignment, officers with a medium level of training, officers with post-secondary education, and officers who did not live in Harrisburg. Clearly, many of the policemen interviewed did not feel that foot patrols yield substantial productivity improvements.

7. The reaction to one-man patrol cars was not favorable. In fact, 75 percent of those interviewed felt that the negative effects were more important than the positive ones. The main reason offered against this patrol change was that one-man cars were unsafe for the officer involved. Of all the reasons offered against this change, 56.4 percent focused on officer safety.

8. When the officers in the sample were asked to take a Harrisburg resident's perspective in ranking the 21 productivity factors, the need for more foot patrol emerged as the most important factor. Sixty percent of those interviewed picked this factor as being among the top 3 from a resident's perspective.

9. Another patrol-related factor, "Increasing the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments," was also rated highly by the police as a factor residents would emphasize. (Twenty-nine percent of the sample ranked this factor as either first, second, or third from a resident's perspective.) This factor was the only one,

however, that also was rated highly by the police themselves (not taking a resident's perspective).

Uses of the Survey Findings

The findings reported in this discussion can be used in at least two related ways:

1. They can be used as a source of information by City officials. The advantage that the information reported in this document has is that it was not filtered through the chain of command in the Bureau. Thus, the biases that might be expected if members of the Bureau solicited opinions on the issues reported herein are minimized.

2. The findings reported here can be viewed as an agenda for discussing changes that need to be made in the Bureau. The emphasis officers placed on the need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy, for example, needs to be kept in mind if any administrative reorganization is to meet the needs of Bureau personnel. Other findings can be treated in the same way--as a basis for discussing changes that are intended as ways of moving toward a more productive Police Bureau.

THE ISSUE OF POLICE PRODUCTIVITY

Background

In the Spring of 1975, the Institute of Public Administration conducted a community survey in Harrisburg. A total of 423 households were sampled, and a substantial portion of the survey questionnaire focused on the issues of crime and the police. Essentially, the survey yielded a resident's perspective on the police services provided in Harrisburg. An Institute report of the survey findings was prepared and titled A Report of Harrisburg Residents' Evaluations and Preferences for Local Governmental Programs and Services. As the results of the community survey were being analyzed, it became apparent that an important viewpoint on the process of delivering police services was missing--namely, the perspective of the officers who provide services to Harrisburg residents. It was decided to develop a survey questionnaire that would be administered to a sample of police officers in the City. A substantial part of the final version dealt with how police officers view their environment, their own Bureau, and their interactions with Harrisburg residents.

The issue of police productivity was raised in connection with the survey in part because the Institute of Public Administration was, and currently is, developing a system to improve productivity in the Police and Fire Bureaus in York, Pennsylvania. The efforts in York, which have focused on the Fire Bureau thus far, consist in part of identifying specific targets for productivity improvement by discussing Bureau operations with key administrators. In addition, however, steps have

been taken to develop a productivity incentive plan for this Bureau. An important part of developing workable versions of such plans is to involve "rank-and-file" members of a department in discussions leading up to the drafting of an incentive plan. In sum, not only is it important to learn the administrator's perspective, but also to learn the employee's perspective as well.

A survey questionnaire, administered to a sample of police officers, provides an opportunity to examine the issue of productivity by (1) yielding information on specific factors that are perceived as important in improving productivity and (2) obtaining this information from a representative sample of officers (including administrators and "rank-and-file" personnel).

Defining Police Productivity

Productivity, as it pertains to the provision of police services, is a term for which there is no widely agreed-upon definition. The main difficulty stems from the fact that measuring units of output of police services can be a complex task. In contrast to situations in the private sector, where the units of output of a production process are generally discrete and can be counted individually, units of police services are more difficult to measure and quantify. Part of the problem is that a lack of agreement exists over what the outputs of police departments are. For example, if one looks at patrol services provided by a police department, it is possible to emphasize a variety of "outputs." Among these are: number of noncriminal calls responded to, number of crime-related calls responded to, number of patrol miles logged by officers, number of security checks performed, number of

traffic citations issued, or number of arrests made. In addition, one can include outputs such as the level of perceived security from crimes, the level of satisfaction with the way police handle victimization incidents, or the level of confidence in the police. Depending on one's definition of the objectives of police patrol services, any or all of these could be considered outputs.

A second issue is also involved. Even if it were possible to agree on ways of counting units of output for a police department and therefore to form a productivity ratio of units of input (generally dollars) to units of output, measures of the quality of the police services produced may be lacking. Clearly, a highly "productive" department, measured by taking a ratio of dollars per unit of output (number of calls responded to, for example), may be an ineffective police department if the outputs are not generating results or impacts.

An appropriate definition of police productivity, then, should emphasize both the quantity of outputs produced as well as their quality. If the number of arrests is viewed as an output of a police department, one way of modifying this measure to include an emphasis on quality of arrest would be to formulate a ratio:

$$\frac{\text{number of arrests surviving first judicial screening}}{\text{number of arrests}}$$

Developing a definition of productivity that could be used in the context of the survey was a key methodological problem. The "operational" definition that was selected is a general one, reflecting definitions of police productivity that have been developed by other analysts.[1]

---

[1]Marc Holzer, "Police Productivity: A Conceptual Framework for Measurement and Improvement," Journal of Police Science and Administration (December, 1973), p. 460

All officers in the sample were instructed to think of police productivity as follows:

> The next several questions are focused on the issue of police productivity. You may have your own idea of what police productivity means; but in answering the following questions, please think of productivity as being the level of police service your department provides as compared to the total cost of providing that level of services.
>
> Improvements in productivity could therefore take the following two forms:
>
> (1) Maintaining the current level of services at a reduced cost.
>
> (2) Improving the current level of services for the same cost.

This definition was included as part of the introduction to question 58 on page 18 of the survey. (See Appendix B of this report for a copy of the entire questionnaire.) In the definition, the "level of services" is intended to get at both the quantity of services provided as well as their quality. Emphasis is also placed on the cost of providing levels of service to reflect the need to take into account the resources expended in relation to the quality and quantity of services that result from using those resources.

Clearly, "level of services" is not a precise way of defining outputs. In fact, the definition of police productivity used in the survey encourages each officer to use his own image of Police Bureau outputs in responding to the questions. A key issue then is whether the officers interviewed held a similar view of the most important police services provided by the Bureau. Responses to one question in particular indicated that higher levels of police productivity were related by the officers to providing more services that focused on controlling crimes in the City. Officers rated highly "Concentrating more on the

problem of crime and less on the provision of individual services" as a way of improving police productivity. Thus, it appears that officers viewed crime-control-related services as a key set of Bureau outputs and that "level of services" were in fact levels of crime-control-related services.[2]

Defining Police Effectiveness

The terms "police productivity" and "police effectiveness" have related definitions. The emphasis on the quality of police outputs as mentioned in the definition of police productivity suggests the need to look at the impacts of the police services in terms of the objectives of the Harrisburg Police Bureau.

An emphasis on the extent to which objectives are attained is in fact the distinguishing characteristic of analyzing police effectiveness. An important difference between productivity and effectiveness is the emphasis that is placed on costs of providing police services in measuring productivity.

---

[2]Responses to one other question corroborate this finding. Officers were asked, "If less police time were spent providing services that relate to noncriminal public order, for example, rescuing pets and controlling domestic arguments, what impact, if any, would this have on police effectiveness?" Eighty-five percent of those interviewed indicated that such a change would improve effectiveness. Thus, effectiveness is also related by officers to activities that focus on the crime-control functions of the police.

PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS RELATED TO POLICE PRODUCTIVITY

The Findings

Characteristics of the Sample

A total of 52 sworn officers were interviewed by Institute of Public Administration staff over a 3-month period from November, 1975, through January, 1976. All respondents were male officers, and only 3 of the 52 interviewed were Black. The average age of the interviewees was 38.4 years, with the youngest being 24 and the oldest being 62 years old. Of those interviewed, 88.5 percent were married, 5.8 percent were single, and another 5.7 percent were either separated or divorced.

Fifteen officers (28.8 percent) indicated they lived in Harrisburg, whereas the rest resided outside the City limits. Of those who lived in the City, the average number of years they had lived in Harrisburg was 41 years.

The sample of officers was drawn so that a distinction between command- and noncommand-ranked officers in the Bureau was made. In selecting persons to be interviewed, the entire roster of the Bureau was divided so that patrolmen were distinguished from those with a command rank (corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, or the Chief). A total of 34 patrolmen were selected randomly; and of those, 25 were interviewed. The remaining 9 could not be contacted due to a variety of unforeseen circumstances. A total of 27 command-rank officers were interviewed from the Bureau roster of 44 command-rank officers. The reason for sampling a high proportion of command-level officers was to obtain reliable data from those in the Bureau who have

formal decision-making authority and may also have a different perspective on productivity improvements and the effects of police activities than do patrolmen. A total of 5 corporals, 8 sergeants, 8 lieutenants, and 5 captains were interviewed. The Chief of the Bureau, Paul D. King, was also interviewed.

The 52 officers interviewed had worked an average of 13 years for the Police Bureau; 13 had been on the force less than 6 years, and the remaining 39 indicated they had been there for 6 or more years.

On a division-by-division basis, 29 men from Patrol and Traffic were interviewed, 9 from Staff and Technical were interviewed, 4 detectives were interviewed, 3 Youth Aid officers were interviewed, 3 foot patrol officers were included, and 1 officer each from Community Relations and the Chief's Office were included in the sample. The remaining 2 interviewees could not be placed in any of the above divisions; 1 indicated he was responsible for enforcing pet-related ordinances, and the other did not respond to the question.

Thirty-one of those interviewed indicated they currently had a street-related assignment, 17 classified themselves as administrative personnel, and another 4 indicated they regularly did both kinds of work.

The average number of days of training for those in the sample was 60 days, or 12 weeks. In terms of education, the average number of credit hours of formal post-secondary education was 21.5. Thirty-two officers, however, indicated they had no education credit hours. Eight officers indicated they had at least the equivalent of an Associate Degree; and the other 12 men indicated they had some formal education, but less than an Associate Degree.

Overall Rankings of Factors for Improving Police Productivity

All officers interviewed were presented with a list of 21 suggested changes that might improve police productivity. The 21 changes, or "productivity improvement factors," were put together from previous studies that had been done on improving police productivity.[3] They represented a wide range of possible changes, some large and some small, that might be undertaken by administrators in a police department. Some of the factors--higher salaries, for example--would also require action on the part of City Council and the Mayor in order to be implemented.

Each interviewee was asked to judge each factor as to its potential for increasing police productivity on a scale from 1 to 10. A rating of "1" indicated that a factor had very little potential; a rating of "10" indicated that a factor had very high potential. After having rated all 21 factors, officers were asked what additional factors, if any, would relate to police productivity. Thus, in addition to the list of items in the survey, respondents were able to add factors to that list. Finally, each officer was asked to select the 4 factors that had the highest potential, select 4 additional factors that had the lowest potential, and to pick 3 factors that Harrisburg residents would view as having the highest potential.

---

[3]Among the studies that were consulted, several were particularly helpful. They are: Gary B. Hirsch and Lucius J. Riccio, "Measuring and Improving the Productivity of Police Patrol," Journal of Police Science and Administration (June, 1974); Marc Holzer, "Police Productivity: A Conceptual Framework for Measurement and Improvement," Journal of Police Science and Administration (December, 1973); and The Urban Institute, "Measuring Police Crime Control Productivity," The Challenge of Productivity Diversity (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1972).

In the discussion which follows, the relative ratings of the 21 factors will be emphasized as a means of distinguishing between factors that have a high productivity improvement potential and those that have a low potential. Although respondents were also asked to select specific factors that had a high or a low potential, the factors selected corresponded closely to those that were rated as having a high or a low potential respectively. In sum, the ratings of the 21 factors and the selection of high- and low-potential factors yielded similar findings.

Productivity Factors Rated as Having the Highest Potential For Improving Police Productivity

Among the 21 factors that were presented to the 52 officers in the sample, the one that was rated highest on the average was "Fair and equally administered promotion policies," with an average rating of 8.5 on the scale from 1 to 10. A second factor, which was given nearly as high an average rating (8.4), was "More in-service training for officers." Three other factors--"Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual services to citizens"; "Better equipment, e.g., radio scramblers"; and "More basic training required for new recruits"--were rated 7.8, 7.7, and 7.6, respectively, by the officers in the sample. Among the top 5 factors, then, were 2 that emphasized more training to improve productivity.

In order to examine these "high-potential" factors in more detail, the sample of officers was subdivided in a number of different ways. For each separate group of officers, ratings of all 21 factors were reexamined to determine if the 5 factors that emerged as being important overall continued to be important among subclassifications of the

officers. A total of 6 ways of grouping the sample were employed. Thus, officers were classified as: (1) patrol or command rank; (2) as having a street or an administrative assignment; (3) as having low (1 week to 9 weeks), medium (9 weeks to 13 weeks), or high (13 weeks to 38 weeks) levels of training; (4) as having no formal post-secondary education, less than an Associate Degree, or the equivalent of an Associate Degree or more; (5) as either living in Harrisburg or not; and finally (6) as having been on the force for less than 6 years or 6 years or more.

Table 1 displays the top 5 factors for each of the groupings of officers, as well as for the sample as a whole. As can be seen, a fair and equally administered promotion policy and a perceived need for more in-service training consistently were ranked among the top 5 factors for all groups. In fact, the perceived need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy dominated the rankings for officers of patrol rank; officers with a street assignment; officers with low, medium, or high levels of training; officers with either no college or less than an Associate Degree; and officers who did not live in Harrisburg. More in-service training was ranked first by command-level officers, by officers with an administrative assignment, and by officers who lived in Harrisburg.

The factor "Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual citizen services" was also among the top 5 for many groupings of officers: those of a command rank; those with an administrative assignment; those with low, medium, or high levels of training; those with no college or less than an Associate Degree or those with more education; those officers living in the City,

Table 1

TOP FIVE PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS FOR THE WHOLE SAMPLE AND FOR GROUPS WITHIN THE SAMPLE

Overall Sample

Factor	Mean Average Rating
Fair and equally administered promotion policy*	8.5
More in-service training for officers*	8.4
Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual service*	7.8
Better equipment, e.g., radio scramblers*	7.7
More basic training required for new recruits*	7.6

Productivity Factors by Rank of Officer

Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Promotion policy	8.8	More in-service training	8.5
More in-service training	8.4	Less waiting in court to give testimony*	8.3
Better equipment	8.0	Promotion policy	8.3
More basic training	7.8	Less individual services	8.1
Higher salaries	7.5	Better equipment	7.4

*Subsequent descriptions of these factors will be shortened to facilitate presenting them in the Table.

Table 1
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Assignment of Officer

Street		Administrative	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Promotion policy	8.6	More in-service training	8.6
More in-service training	8.3	Less individual services	8.4
Better equipment	8.1	Promotion policy	8.4
More basic training	7.7	Permanent team (district) assignments*	7.7
Increase the real patrol time of those given street assignments*	7.5	More basic training	7.5

Productivity Factors by Residence of Officer

Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
More in-service training	8.9	Promotion policy	8.5
Promotion policy	8.7	More in-service training	8.2
Less waiting in court	8.5	Better equipment	7.9
More basic training	8.0	Less individual services	7.7
Less individual services	8.0	More basic training	7.4

*Subsequent descriptions of these factors will be shortened to facilitate presenting them in the Table.

Table 1
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Years on the Force

Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
More in-service training	9.0	Promotion policy	8.4
Promotion policy	8.9	More in-service training	8.2
More real patrol time	8.2	Less individual services	7.8
More basic training	8.1	Better equipment	7.6
Better equipment	7.9	Permanent team assignments	7.4

Productivity Factors by Level of Training

Low Level of Training (1 week to 9 weeks) N = 15		Medium Level of Training (9 weeks to 13 weeks) N = 18		High Level of Training (13 weeks to 38 weeks) N = 16	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Promotion policy	8.7	Promotion policy	8.9	Promotion policy	8.0
More in-service training	8.6	More in-service training	8.6	More in-service training	8.0
More basic training	7.7	Less individual services	8.4	More basic training	7.6
Less individual services	7.7	Better equipment	8.3	Less individual services	7.4
Higher salaries	7.3	Less waiting in court	8.3	More real patrol time	7.3

Table 1
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Level of Education

No College Education		Less than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Promotion policy	8.6	Promotion policy	8.9	More real patrol time	8.1
More in-service training	8.5	More in-service training	8.4	More in-service training	8.0
More basic training	8.2	Better equipment	7.4	Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars	7.9
Better equipment	8.0	Higher salaries	7.3	Less individual services	7.8
Less individual services	8.0	Less individual services	7.2	Promotion policy	7.6

as well as those not living there; and those officers on the force for 6 years or more.

The need for better equipment was also a high-priority factor for patrolmen and command-rank officers, for officers with street assignments, for officers with a medium level of training, for those in the low- or medium-education categories, for those who did not live in the City, and for officers who had been on the force 6 years or more.

More basic training for new recruits was ranked among the top 5 factors for patrolmen, officers with street assignments, officers having administrative assignments, officers having either a low or high level of training, officers with no college education, officers who lived in the City, officers who did not live in Harrisburg, and officers who had been on the force for less than 6 years.

To sum up to this point: the 5 factors that were identified as being of high potential for the overall sample tended to be important as well for different subgroups of the officers interviewed. Thus, there appeared to be a general consensus among the respondents, regardless of their particular background or position in the Bureau that the 5 factors cited in Table 1 merit serious consideration as ways of improving police productivity.

There were, however, additional factors that appeared to be important for some groups of police officers and not for others. Specifically, "Less waiting in court to give testimony" was ranked highly by command-rank officers. It received an average rank of 8.3, which is slightly less than the rank of 8.5 attained for more in-service training for that group. Officers with either medium or high training

levels also ranked this factor among the top 5, as did those who indicated that they lived in the City.

A second factor which was rated highly by several groupings of officers was "Increase the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments." Those officers who indicated they have street assignments did in fact indicate that this factor was among the top 5 in terms of productivity potential. In addition, officers who had the highest level of training or had the highest level of education picked this factor as being among the top 5 for them. The only other patrol-related factor that was selected by any grouping of interviewees as having high potential was "Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars." Officers with at least the equivalent of an Associate Degree rated it among the top 5.

Higher salaries as a means of improving productivity were not generally rated highly by those officers in the sample. Three specific groups of officers (patrolmen; those with a low level of training; and those that had some college, but not the equivalent of an Associate Degree) rated higher salaries among the top 5 factors; but even for these officers, the mean ratings yielded a ranking of either fourth or fifth.

Productivity Factors Rated as Having the Lowest Potential For Improving Police Productivity

By examining the relative ratings that officers in the sample assigned to all 21 factors, it was also possible to isolate factors that had the lowest perceived potential for productivity improvements. Table 2 presents a summary of these factors for the overall sample and

Table 2

LOWEST FIVE PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS FOR THE WHOLE SAMPLE AND FOR GROUPS WITHIN THE SAMPLE

Overall Sample

Factor	Mean Average Rating
Less direct supervision by superiors*	4.3
Misdemeanor summons in lieu of physical arrest and incarceration*	4.4
Greater use of unsworn personnel*	4.7
Unionization of police*	4.9
Fewer restrictions on the use of force*	5.0

Productivity Factors by Rank of Officer

Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
More unsworn personnel	4.4	Unionization	3.9
Less supervision	4.5	Misdemeanor summons	4.0
Reduce report requirements	4.6	Less supervision	4.2
Misdemeanor summons	5.0	Less emphasis on probable cause	4.4
Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols*	5.0	Use of force	4.8

*Subsequent descriptions of factors will be shortened to facilitate presenting them in the Table.

Table 2
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Assignment of Officer

Street		Administrative	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Less supervision	4.3	Misdemeanor summons	3.4
More unsworn personnel	4.8	Unionization	3.8
More foot patrol	4.8	Less supervision	4.1
Use of force	5.1	More unsworn personnel	4.6
Misdemeanor summons	5.2	Probable cause	4.6

Productivity Factors by Residence of Officer

Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Unionization	3.9	Misdemeanor summons	4.2
Less supervision	4.3	Less supervision	4.4
Use of force	4.7	More unsworn personnel	4.5
More unsworn personnel	5.0	More foot patrol	4.6
Misdemeanor summons	5.0	Probable cause	5.1

Table 2
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Years on the Force

Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
More foot patrol	3.8	Less supervision	4.1
Misdemeanor summons	4.8	Unionization	4.2
Less supervision	5.0	Misdemeanor summons	4.3
More unsworn personnel	5.0	Probable cause	4.5
Reduce report requirements	5.2	More unsworn personnel	4.5

Productivity Factors by Level of Training

Low Level of Training (1 week to 9 weeks) N = 15		Medium Level of Training (9 weeks to 13 weeks) N = 18		High Level of Training (13 weeks to 38 weeks) N = 16	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
More unsworn personnel	3.1	Misdemeanor summons	4.7	Less supervision	3.6
Less supervision	3.2	Use of force	5.3	Unionization	4.2
Misdemeanor summons	3.6	More foot patrol	5.6	Probable cause	4.2
Use of force	4.3	Unionization	5.6	More unsworn personnel	4.5
Reduce report requirements	5.0	Probable cause	5.8	Misdemeanor summons	4.8

Table 2
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Level of Education

No College Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating	Factor	Mean Rating
Misdemeanor summons	4.1	Less supervision	3.8	More foot patrol	4.1
Unionization	4.3	Reduce report requirements	4.2	Less supervision	4.4
Less supervision	4.3	Misdemeanor summons	4.5	Unionization	4.5
More unsworn personnel	4.6	More unsworn personnel	4.7	Use of force	4.8
Probable cause	4.9	More foot patrol	4.8	More unsworn personnel	5.0

by the classifications of officers discussed in the previous section of this report.

Taking all 52 officers as a group, the factor with the lowest average rating was "Less direct supervision by superiors," with a mean rating of 4.3 on the 10-point scale. Equally low in perceived productivity potential was "Misdemeanor summons in lieu of physical arrest and incarceration," with an average rating of 4.4. Among the 21 factors, the other 3 that were rated lowest were "Greater use of unsworn personnel," "Unionization of police," and "Fewer restrictions on the use of force."

Although these same 5 factors tended to be rated lowest by the various groups of police officers in the sample, some interesting differences also emerged. "Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols," for example, was rated among the lowest 5 factors by officers of a patrol rank, officers with a street assignment, officers with a medium level of training, officers with either a medium or high level of college education, and officers who did not live in Harrisburg. Thus, although the Bureau is at present expending resources on foot patrols, several groups of officers, including those who are patrolmen or have a street assignment, felt that expending more resources on foot patrol was a relatively poor way of improving the productivity of the Bureau.

Among other factors that were rated as having a low potential, "Less emphasis on probable cause," was selected by command-rank officers, those with administrative assignments, those with either medium or high levels of training, those with no college-level education, and those officers not living in Harrisburg.

The only other factor that was rated relatively low by more than one group of respondents was "Reduce report requirements." Patrol-rank officers, officers with a relatively low level of training, and officers with a medium level of college education rated this factor so that it appeared among the bottom 5 of the 21 factors considered.

Additional Factors with Potential For Improving Police Productivity

Although the 21 factors that were rated by all officers constituted a wide range of possible policy changes, there was clearly a need to elicit any additional factors that related to police productivity. Twenty-four of the 52 officers mentioned additional factors; and since some offered several suggestions, a total of 45 separate responses were recorded.

Table 3 presents a summary of the responses for the entire sample. Better supervision practices (higher administration backing of men, for example) made up 17.7 percent of the mentions. An additional 11.1 percent focused on better communications within the Police Bureau (better communication among divisions or better communication among ranks, for example). Although 1 of the 21 factors emphasized a fair and equally administered promotion policy, 6.7 percent of the additional responses focused on promotion and job mobility practices as well (revision of promotion system or improving job mobility among divisions within the Bureau, for example). Another 8.8 percent of the responses emphasized the need for morale improvements in the Bureau.

A group of these additional factors can be viewed as indicating the need for improved administrative management within the Bureau.

Table 3

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE

Additional Factors	Number	Percent
1) More manpower	4	8.8%
2) Better communications within the Department*	5	11.1
3) Better supervision practices*	8	17.7
4) Promotion practices*	3	6.7
5) Morale improvements*	4	8.8
6) Recognition for superior performance*	2	4.4
7) Reducing favoritism*	4	8.8
8) More sophisticated planning	3	6.7
9) Change entrance requirements	1	2.2
10) Expand the involvement of citizens	2	4.4
11) Other mentions	9	20.0
Total	45	99.6%

*If the mentions of Factors 2 through 7 are added together, they constitute 57.5 percent of all mentions.

Thus, better communications within the Bureau, better supervision practices, promotion practices, morale improvements, recognition for superior performance, and reducing favoritism all focus on aspects of the way the Bureau is managed. More specifically, all are concerned with the interpersonal relationships among officers within the Bureau. If these 6 factors are grouped together, 57.5 percent of all additional responses focused on the management of interpersonal relations in the Bureau. Thirteen of the officers interviewed felt that gains in productivity could be made by concentrating policy formulation efforts in this interpersonal management area.

Additional Productivity Factors as Viewed by Groups of Officers within the Sample

It is worthwhile to reexamine the 45 additional mentions of productivity factors by looking at differences in the distributions of responses between or among different groups of officers in the sample. One problem, however, is that by dividing the 45 mentions between patrol-rank and command-rank officers, for example, the frequencies of each type of additional factor (10 in all) are so small that comparing frequencies of mentions of single factors between patrol-rank and command-rank officers, for example, would yield findings that might be unreliable. Thus, from a statistical point of view, it is more desirable to aggregate types of responses before making comparisons among groups of officers. The disadvantage of aggregating responses is that information which police administrators may find useful is lost. To minimize this difficulty, Tables 4 through 7 present the individual additional mentions, broken down by groups of officers, so

that comparisons other than those made in the following paragraphs can also be made.

The responses in Table 3 can be aggregated so that those additional factors pertaining to the administration of interpersonal relations in the Bureau are taken as one group. Thus, factors 2 through 7 will be focused on in comparing responses of different groups of officers in the sample.

As can be seen from Table 4, patrol-rank officers tended to be more concerned with productivity factors related to administration of interpersonal relations than did those of a command rank. In fact, 65.0 percent of all additional responses from patrolmen emphasized this issue compared to 47.0 percent from command-rank officers.

A similar difference, although less in magnitude, can be seen by comparing the responses of officers with street assignments and those with administrative assignments. Administration of interpersonal relations accounted for 60.0 percent of all street-assigned officers' responses, compared to 50.0 percent for those with an administrative assignment.

Tables 5 and 6 display the additional productivity-related responses for officers with different levels of training and education in the sample. If one focuses on the additional factors that relate to the administration of interpersonal relations, there does not appear to be a consistent association between either training or education levels and officers' perceptions of the importance of these mentions. If factors 2 through 7 are taken together, 65.1 percent of those officers with a low level of training indicated a concern with the management of interpersonal relations as a means of improving

Table 4

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS BY RANK AND ASSIGNMENT OF OFFICER

Additional Factors	Rank				Assignment			
	Patrol Rank		Command Rank		Street		Administrative	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1) More manpower	2	7.7%	2	10.5%	2	6.0%	2	16.7%
2) Better communications within the Department	3	11.5	2	10.5	4	12.1	1	8.3
3) Better supervision practices	5	19.2	3	15.8	6	18.0	2	16.7
4) Promotion practices	2	7.7	1	5.3	3	9.0	0	0.0
5) Morale improvements	2	7.7	2	10.5	2	6.0	2	16.7
6) Recognition for superior performance	1	3.8	1	5.3	1	3.0	1	8.3
7) Reducing favoritism	4	15.3	0	0.0	4	12.1	0	0.0
8) More sophisticated planning	0	0.0	3	15.8	1	3.0	2	16.7
9) Change entrance requirements	1	3.8	0	0.0	1	3.0	0	0.0
10) Expand the involvement of citizens	2	7.7	0	0.0	2	6.0	0	0.0
11) Other mentions	4	15.3	5	26.3	7	21.2	2	16.7
Total	26	99.7%	19	100.0%	33	99.4%	12	100.1%

Table 5

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS BY LEVEL OF TRAINING

Additional Factors	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1) More manpower	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%
2) Better communications within the Department	2	8.7	3	30.0	0	0.0
3) Better supervision practices	5	21.7	1	10.0	2	16.7
4) Promotion practices	2	8.7	1	10.0	0	0.0
5) Morale improvements	3	13.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
6) Recognition for superior performance	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
7) Reducing favoritism	2	8.7	1	10.0	1	8.3
8) More sophisticated planning	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	16.7
9) Change entrance requirements	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
10) Expand the involvement of citizens	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
11) Other mentions	3	13.0	2	20.0	4	33.3
Total	23	99.8%	10	100.0%	12	100.0%

Table 6

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Additional Factors	No Post-Secondary Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1) More manpower	1	4.5%	2	15.4%	1	10.0%
2) Better communications within the Department	2	9.0	0	0.0	3	30.0
3) Better supervision practices	4	18.2	2	15.4	2	20.0
4) Promotion practices	1	4.5	2	15.4	0	0.0
5) Morale improvements	2	9.0	2	15.4	0	0.0
6) Recognition for superior performance	2	9.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7) Reducing favoritism	1	4.5	3	23.0	0	0.0
8) More sophisticated planning	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
9) Change entrance requirements	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
10) Expand the involvement of citizens	0	0.0	1	7.7	1	10.0
11) Other mentions	6	27.3	1	7.7	2	20.0
Total	22	99.6%	13	100.0%	10	100.0%

productivity. A slightly higher proportion of the responses attributed to officers with a medium level of training (70.0 percent) focused on the same 6 factors. However, officers with the highest levels of training in the sample appeared to be relatively less concerned with this problem; only 33.3 percent of their responses focused on management of interpersonal relations.

Table 6 displays the data for officers with different levels of post-secondary formal education. As was the case with training levels, a majority of the responses attributed to officers with no post-secondary education focused on the management of interpersonal relations (54.2 percent); the percentage increased to 69.2 percent for officers with less than the equivalent of an Associate Degree; but decreased to 50.0 percent for those with an Associate Degree or more education.

It is important to note that although there was no simple association between either the levels of training and education and the proportion of responses related to improved management of interpersonal relations, the only group that did not select these factors at least 50.0 percent of the time was the group of highly trained officers in the sample.

Table 7 displays the distribution of additional productivity factors mentioned in terms of the length of time an officer had been on the force and whether an officer lived in Harrisburg or not. Those officers who had been on the force for less than 6 years were more likely to mention factors related to the management of interpersonal relations (70.0 percent of all mentions for this group) than were those on the force a longer period of time (54.3 percent). The fact that 70.0

Table 7

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS
BY YEARS ON THE FORCE AND BY RESIDENCE OF OFFICER

Additional Factors	Years on the Force				Residence			
	Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More		Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1) More manpower	0	0.0%	4	11.4%	0	0.0%	4	11.4%
2) Better communications within the Department	3	30.0	2	5.7	0	0.0	5	14.3
3) Better supervision practices	2	20.0	6	17.1	4	40.0	4	11.4
4) Promotion practices	0	0.0	3	8.6	0	0.0	3	8.6
5) Morale improvements	1	10.0	3	8.6	0	0.0	4	11.4
6) Recognition for superior performance	0	0.0	2	5.7	1	10.0	1	2.8
7) Reducing favoritism	1	10.0	3	8.6	1	10.0	3	8.6
8) More sophisticated planning	0	0.0	3	8.6	2	20.0	1	2.8
9) Change entrance requirements	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.8
10) Expand the involvement of citizens	1	10.0	1	2.8	0	0.0	2	5.7
11) Other mentions	1	10.0	8	22.8	2	20.0	7	20.0
Total	10	100.0%	35	99.9%	10	100.0%	35	99.8%

30

percent of all responses from the officers in the less-than-6-years category focused on improving the management of interpersonal relations in the Bureau indicates the importance of this problem to younger officers in the Bureau.

If one groups the officers who offered additional mentions into those living in the City versus those not, no appreciable difference in the level of concern with the management of interpersonal relations emerges. However, a majority of both groups indicated that additional factors 2 through 7 were worth mentioning (60.0 percent for officers residing in the City compared to 57.1 percent of the responses for officers not living in the City).

To sum up, different groups of officers within the sample, as well as those in the sample taken as a whole, tended to be concerned about additional productivity factors related to the management of interpersonal relations in the Police Bureau. The only groups of officers which did not mention these factors at least 50.0 percent of the time were command-rank officers and officers with a high level of training.

Productivity Factors that Police Officers Perceived as Important to Harrisburg Residents

In addition to questions that focused on police officers' perceptions of factors that related to improving the productivity of the City Police Bureau, officers also were asked to select factors, from among the 21 presented to each of them, which Harrisburg residents would choose as having a high productivity potential.

The responses for the overall sample and for different groups within the sample were strikingly similar, suggesting a broad consensus

among police officers regarding factors that citizens perceive as important. As can be seen from Table 8, 60.0 percent of all officers sampled selected "Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols" as being among the top 3 factors citizens would pick to improve police productivity. In addition, 31.0 percent selected "Getting regular feedback from City residents on the job the police are doing"; and 29.0 percent selected "Increasing the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments." Two of the 3 factors most frequently selected were related to police patrol strategies.

This latter finding is confirmed by examining the factors that different groups of officers selected. "Having a greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols" is selected as being among the top 3 factors by every group in the sample. This factor is selected more frequently, or at least as frequently, by every group of officers than is any other factor. Only those officers with high levels of education or high levels of training selected this factor less than 50.0 percent of the time.

The factor related to obtaining regular citizen feedback was rated by all groups of officers as being among the top 3 that citizens would pick. This finding is not surprising, given that officers might be expected to perceive citizens as wanting a regular input into evaluating the job the police are doing.

It is worth noting that from the police officers' perspectives obtaining regular citizen feedback did not get rated highly. Thus, although perceiving that citizens would think that regular feedback would improve police productivity, the police officers themselves felt that other factors had much more productivity-related potential.

Table 8

PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS RANKED BY POLICE OFFICERS AS BEING MOST IMPORTANT TO HARRISBURG RESIDENTS

Overall Sample

Factor	Percentage of Officers Ranking the Factor Among the Top Three Citizens Would Select**
Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols*	60.0%
Getting regular feedback on City residents on the job the police are doing*	31.0
Increase the real patrol time of those given street assignments*	29.0

Productivity Factors by Rank of Officer

Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	68.0%	More foot patrol	52.0%
Regular citizen feedback	28.0	Regular citizen feedback	33.0
Increase real patrol time	24.0	Increase real patrol time	33.0

*Subsequent descriptions of these factors will be shortened to facilitate presenting them in the Table.

**This description of the percentages presented will be shortened elsewhere in the Table to facilitate presenting the findings. It is important to note that the percentages in this and other columns in the Table do not add up to 100 percent. The reason is that each percentage is calculated by totaling the number of officers who select a given factor as either the first or second or third choice of citizens, and then expressing that total as a percentage of all officers who could have chosen the factor as being first, second, or third.

33

Table 8
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Assignment of Officer

Street		Administrative	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	65.0%	More foot patrol	52.0%
Increase real patrol time	29.0	Regular citizen feedback	38.0
Regular citizen feedback	26.0	Increase real patrol time	28.0

Productivity Factors by Level of Training

Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	60.0%	More foot patrol	70.0%	More foot patrol	38.0%
Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars*	40.0	Regular citizen feedback	44.0	Increase real patrol time	38.0%
Regular citizen feedback	27.0	Increase real patrol time	33.0	Regular citizen feedback	25.0

Productivity Factors by Level of Education

No College Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	63.0%	More foot patrol	58.0%	More foot patrol	38.0%
Regular citizen feedback	34.0	More car patrol	41.0	Regular citizen feedback	38.0
Increase real patrol time	28.0	Increase real patrol time	33.0	Increase real patrol time	25.0

*Subsequent descriptions of these factors will be shortened to facilitate presenting them in the Table.

Table 8
(Continued)

Productivity Factors by Years on the Force

Less than Six Years		Six Years or More	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	70.0%	More foot patrol	54.0%
Increase real patrol time	38.0%	Regular citizen feedback	30.0
Regular citizen feedback	31.0	Increase real patrol time	26.0

Productivity Factors by Residence of Officer

Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
Factor	Percent	Factor	Percent
More foot patrol	60.0%	More foot patrol	59.0%
More car patrol	33.0	Regular citizen feedback	32.0
Regular citizen feedback	27.0	Increase real patrol time	32.0

At another point in the interview, all officers were asked to rate how well citizens in Harrisburg understand the job of the police. As is shown in Table 9, more than two thirds of those interviewed indicated in response to the question that residents either did not understand the job of the police at all or not too well. No one indicated that residents understand the job of the police very well. Thus, it is not surprising that officers themselves would not rate regular citizen feedback on the job they were doing as having a high productivity potential.

Table 9

LEVEL OF CITIZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE JOB OF THE POLICE

	Number	Percent
Fairly well	16	31.4%
Not too well	33	64.7
Not at all	2	3.9
Total	51	100.0%

The other factors that various groups of officers felt citizens would rate highly all related to the patrol function of the Bureau. "Increase the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments" was rated among the top 3 factors by all groups of officers except those with a low level of training and those who lived in Harrisburg. For the latter 2 groups, "Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars," was instead ranked among the top 3 factors.

OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF TWO ALTERNATE PATROL STRATEGIES AND AN ALTERNATE SERVICE-PROVISION STRATEGY

OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF TWO ALTERNATE PATROL STRATEGIES AND AN ALTERNATE SERVICE-PROVISION STRATEGY

Findings for the Entire Sample

During the course of the interviews, respondents were asked 3 questions that referred to alternate tactical and procedural approaches to providing selected police services. In general terms, the 3 questions referred to the following aspects of policing: the effects of one officer per patrol car, the effects of having more foot patrols, and the impact on police effectiveness of spending less time providing services that relate to noncriminal public order.

These 3 questions are included in this analysis because they correspond to several of the 21 factors that were discussed in the previous section of this report. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the wording in these questions did not include an emphasis on the costs of providing police services, whereas the productivity-related questions did. Differences in the responses to the patrol-related questions between the previous sections of this report and the present one can be attributed, at least in part, to the differences in the way the questions were worded.

The questions of one officer to a car and increased foot patrols were asked in open-ended form to elicit both positive and negative implications of these changes. In addition, a question was asked to determine whether the positive or negative aspects of these changes were more important. The question of provision of less individual services was also asked in an open-ended fashion. From the tone and

substance of the responses, the coding of this question was designed to distinguish between responses with positive and negative implications.

Perceived Effects of One-Man Patrol Cars

In response to the question "What do you feel would be the effects of having one officer in a patrol car--in a positive sense?", slightly over 20.0 percent of the total number of reasons mentioned related to better coverage provided by one-man cars, as is shown in Table 10. The response category of better coverage accounts for factors such as more availability, better response time, and more thorough patrol. The 2 second most frequent responses, (1) no positive effects for one-man cars and (2) one-man cars providing an increased awareness of the area for the officer, were tied at about 17.0 percent of all responses. The third most frequent response, over 10.0 percent of all mentions, was a reference to a more-cautious officer. The next two responses each received slightly under 10.0 percent of the total mentions. These mentions were categorized as: police visibility and higher productivity. Six percent of the total responses referred to one-man cars as increasing a sense of self-reliance for patrol officers.

Overall sample responses to negative effects of one-man cars portrayed a different pattern than the responses of positive effects. By far, the most frequently mentioned negative effect was the lack of officer safety. Fifty-six percent of all responses indicated that lack of safety is an important negative effect. The second most frequent negative effect related to the occurrence of crime-in-progress calls. Fifteen percent of the total responses emphasized that calls

Table 10

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS

	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars		
1) Better coverage	14	21.5%
2) Better awareness of area	11	16.9
3) No effect	11	16.9
4) More cautious officer	7	10.8
5) Police visibility increased	6	9.2
6) Higher productivity	6	9.2
7) More self-reliance	4	6.2
8) Other response	6	9.2
Total	65	99.9%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars		
1) Lack of officer safety	44	56.4%
2) Some calls require two men	12	15.4
3) Lower productivity	10	12.8
4) Officer confidence decreases	3	3.9
5) Boredom	2	2.6
6) Constraints relating to such a change	1	1.3
7) No negative effects	1	1.3
8) Other response	5	6.4
Total	78	100.1%

for service require 2 men to a responding patrol unit. The third most frequent mention (13.0 percent) related the opinion that one-man cars yielded lower levels of police productivity. Beyond the 3 types discussed above, there were several additional (infrequent) responses. Lower officer confidence was mentioned about 4.0 percent of the time, and boredom was mentioned about 3.0 percent of the time.

When those surveyed were asked if the positive or negative effects of one-man cars were more important, the typical response was that negative effects override the positive effects. Three out of 4, or 75.0 percent, of all 52 officers believed negative effects were more important. This finding was reinforced by the larger total number of negative effects mentioned by officers (78) compared to the number of positive effects mentioned (65).

Perceived Effects of More Foot Patrols

The overall sample responses for the question of the positive effects of more foot patrols referred frequently to effects on the community. Table 11 shows that 26.0 percent of the total responses referred to better community relations. An additional 18.0 percent of all the responses referred to an increased understanding of the area. Tied for third most frequent response, at 14.0 percent of the total, were more contact with people and more effective crime control; increased citizen satisfaction and higher visibility received (respectively) 11.0 percent and 8.0 percent of the total responses. Other responses accounted for 8.0 percent of the total.

The two most frequent responses to the question of negative effects of foot patrols related to the lack of ability of the foot

Table 11

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS

	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols		
1) Better community relations	22	26.2%
2) Increased communiry awareness	15	17.9
3) More contact with people	12	14.3
4) More effective crime control	12	14.3
5) Increased citizen satisfaction	9	10.7
6) Higher visibility	7	8.3
7) More patrol time	1	1.2
8) Other response	6	7.2
Total	84	100.1%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols		
1) Slow response time	22	36.5%
2) Decreased mobility	10	16.1
3) No negative effects	7	11.3
4) Ineffective crime control	7	11.3
5) Officer safety	6	9.7
6) Increased expense	4	6.4
7) Undesirability of foot patrol	2	3.2
8) Other response	3	4.8
9) Don't know	1	1.6
Total	62	100.9%

patrolman to respond to rapidly changing situations. In this regard, 35.0 percent of the responses related to the slow response time of foot patrolmen. Following this was the category of decreased mobility, which accounted for an additional 16.0 percent of the total mentions. The third most frequent responses, no negative effects and ineffective crime control, were tied at 11.0 percent of the total each. Officer safety, at nearly 10.0 percent of the total, was the next most frequent mention. Three additional categories of responses--increased expense, the undesirability of foot patrol, and other responses--received 6.0 percent, 3.0 percent, and 5.0 percent of the total mentions, respectively.

When officers were asked which set of effects was more important for foot patrols, over three-quarters, or 76.0 percent, of those interviewed responded that the positive effects were more important. Twenty percent stated that the negative effects were more important, and 4.0 percent were uncertain. This emphasis on the positive effects of foot patrol was also corroborated by an 84-to-62 edge of the total number of positive effects of foot patrols compared to negative effects.

Perceived Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

The question focusing on the impact on police effectiveness of reduced emphasis on services related to noncriminal public order was asked in a different manner than the questions on one-man cars and increased foot patrols (Table 12). Instead of asking officers to list effects of such a change, officers were asked what impact on police effectiveness less time spent on services related to noncriminal public order would have. By coding the responses so that the positive

Table 12

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS

	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls		
1) More time for crime control	25	42.4%
2) Positive impact on effectiveness	24	40.7
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	7	11.9
4) Positive psychological effects	1	1.7
8) Other response	2	3.4
Total	59	100.1%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls		
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	6	66.7%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	1	11.1
3) Good public relations	1	11.1
8) Other response	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0%

and negative responses were distinguished, 46 (85.0 percent) of the officers who answered this question felt that reduced individual service calls would result in increased police effectiveness. Forty-two percent of the responses that related to positive impacts referred to an increased amount of time that could be directed at crime control. The second most frequent type of response, 41.0 percent, was a general one--emphasizing positive impacts on police effectiveness. Examples of responses that were coded into this category are the following: "crime would decrease," "police would be able to obtain more apprehensions," "response times would decrease," and "overall there would be a great deal of impact." The third most frequently cited type of positive response could be taken as a caution to those who want to reduce individual service calls. Twelve percent of the positive responses referred to the increased effectiveness but mentioned as well that noncriminal calls are essential to the provision of effective police services.

Seven of the 51 members of the Bureau who were asked this question felt that there would be negative effects involved in the reduction of individual service calls. Of the total responses concerning negative effects, two-thirds (6 of 9 responses) related the opinion that noncriminal calls are an essential component of police services. One officer mentioned that there was little importance placed on these calls, while another officer mentioned that such calls foster good public relations.

The Effects of Having a Street or Administrative Assignment on Responses to the Three Questions

Perceptions of One-Man Patrol Cars

As can be seen from Table 13, officers who had a street assignment had more of a tendency (12.2 percent compared to 4.2 percent) to mention that there is more police visibility and better awareness of an area (19.5 percent and 12.5 percent respectively) when one-man cars are used for patrol purposes. Street-assigned officers were also somewhat less likely to perceive that there are not positive effects when one-man cars are used (14.6 percent compared to 20.8 percent).

When negative effects of one-man cars were considered, there was a higher tendency for those having street assignments to mention that certain calls require 2 men (20.8 percent compared to 6.7 percent for administrative-assigned officers). Those officers having a street assignment were somewhat less likely to believe that officer safety is a negative effect of one-man cars (52.1 percent compared to 63.3 percent).

It is interesting to look at the relative importance of positive and negative effects for street-assigned and administrative officers. More officers assigned to street duty felt that the positive effects of one-man cars were more important (27.0 percent street to 10.0 percent administrative). Correspondingly, 72.0 percent of street-assigned officers felt the negative effects outweighed the positive ones, whereas 80.0 percent of administrative-assigned officers felt this way.

Table 13

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING STREET TO ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS

	Street		Administrative	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Better coverage	9	22.0%	5	20.8%
2) Better awareness of area	8	19.5	3	12.5
3) No effect	6	14.6	5	20.8
4) Police visibility increased	5	12.2	1	4.2
5) More cautious officer	5	12.2	2	8.3
6) Higher productivity	3	7.3	3	12.5
7) More self-reliance	2	4.8	2	8.3
8) Other response	3	7.3	3	12.5
Total	41	99.9%	24	99.9%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Lack of officer safety	25	52.1%	19	63.3%
2) Some calls require two men	10	20.8	2	6.7
3) Lower productivity	6	12.5	4	13.3
4) Boredom	2	4.2	0	0.0
5) Officer confidence decreases	1	2.1	2	6.7
6) No negative effects	1	2.1	0	0.0
7) Constraints relating to such change	0	0.0	1	3.3
8) Other response	3	6.3	2	6.7
Total	48	100.1%	30	100.0%

Perceptions of More Foot Patrols

There are very slight differences in comparisons of positive effects of more foot patrols between those with street assignments and those with administrative assignments. More significant differences appear when negative effects are considered. As Table 14 shows, there is a large difference in the perception that mobility would decrease with the use of more foot patrols. Nearly 30.0 percent of those perceptions from officers with street assignments indicated that decreased mobility would be a negative effect, whereas none of the administrative personnel responded with this mention.

Although there were few important differences in the effects of foot patrols as perceived by those with street or administrative assignments, 71.0 percent of those with street assignments believed the positive effects were more important, while 85.0 percent of those with administrative assignments believed the positive effects were most important.

Perceptions of Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

The comparison between those officers with street and administrative assignments for the positive effects of reducing individual service calls yielded 2 findings worth reporting. As can be seen from Table 15, those holding administrative assignments tended to place more emphasis on the response that more time could be spent on crime control (48.0 percent of the responses from those with an administrative assignment compared to 38.0 percent of the responses from officers with a street assignment). The second difference is that a higher percentage of

Table 14

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING STREET TO ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS

	Street		Administrative	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Better community relations	14	28.0%	8	23.5%
2) More contact with people	8	16.0	4	11.8
3) Increased community awareness	8	16.0	7	20.6
4) More effective crime control	8	16.0	4	11.8
5) Increased citizen satisfaction	5	10.0	4	11.8
6) Higher visibility	4	8.0	3	8.8
7) More patrol time	1	2.0	0	0.0
8) Other response	2	4.0	4	11.8
Total	50	100.0%	34	100.1%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Slow response time	12	34.3%	10	37.0%
2) Decreased mobility	10	28.6	0	0.0
3) No negative effects	3	8.6	4	14.8
4) Ineffective crime control	3	8.6	4	14.8
5) Officer safety	3	8.6	3	11.1
6) Increased expense	1	2.9	3	11.1
7) Undesirability of foot patrol	0	0.0	2	7.4
8) Other response	2	5.7	1	3.7
9) Don't know	1	2.9	0	0.0
Total	35	100.2%	27	99.9%

Table 15

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING STREET TO ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS

	Street		Administrative	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Positive impact on effectiveness	16	47.1%	8	32.0%
2) More time for crime control	13	38.2	12	48.0
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	5	14.8	2	8.0
4) Positive psychological effects	0	0.0	1	4.0
8) Other response	0	0.0	2	8.0
Total	34	100.1%	25	100.0%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	4	57.2%	2	100.0%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	1	14.3	0	0.0
3) Good public relations	1	14.3	0	0.0
8) Other response	1	14.3	0	0.0
Total	7	100.1%	2	100.0%

mentions from those with street assignments indicated that reduced service calls would improve police effectiveness. Apparently officers with street assignments had a tendency to see less time being freed up for crime control but greater effectiveness resulting from a reduction in noncriminal service calls. Thus, some evidence exists which indicates street-assigned officers view police effectiveness in other than a crime-control-related way.

From the descriptive analysis of responses to the question focusing on reduced individual service calls, it can be concluded that street-assigned personnel believe that there are more negative effects of reduced service calls than do administrative-assigned personnel. (Seventeen percent of the street-assignment mentions refer to negative effects, while only 8.0 percent of the administrative-assignment mentions refer to negative effects.)

The Effects of Number of Years on the Force on Responses to the Three Questions

Perceptions of One-Man Patrol Cars

The statistics reported in Table 16 indicate that officers who had been on the force for less than 6 years were of the opinion that one-man patrol cars would lead to a better awareness of the area (26.3 percent of the responses for those with less than 6 years compared to 13.1 percent for those with 6 years or more). Second, the officers with the lesser amount of time on the force believed that officers would be much more cautious when in a one-man patrol car (21.1 percent of the responses compared to 6.5 percent of the responses for those on the force for 6 years or more).

Table 16

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING LESS THAN SIX YEARS ON THE FORCE TO SIX OR MORE YEARS ON THE FORCE

	Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Better awareness of area	5	26.3%	6	13.1%
2) Better coverage	4	21.1	10	21.7
3) More cautious officer	4	21.1	3	6.5
4) Police visibility increased	3	15.8	3	6.5
5) No effect	3	15.8	8	17.4
6) Higher productivity	0	0.0	6	13.1
7) More self-reliance	0	0.0	4	8.7
8) Other response	0	0.0	6	13.1
Total	19	100.1%	46	100.1%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Lack of officer safety	9	45.0%	35	60.3%
2) Some calls require two men	4	20.0	8	13.8
3) Lower productivity	3	15.0	7	12.1
4) Boredom	2	10.0	0	0.0
5) Officer confidence decreases	1	5.0	2	3.5
6) Constraints relating to such change	0	0.0	1	1.7
7) No negative effects	0	0.0	1	1.7
8) Other response	1	5.0	4	6.9
Total	20	100.0%	58	100.0%

Concerning the negative effects of one-man cars, those interviewed who were on the force for less than 6 years felt that officer safety in a one-man car patrol was less of an issue (45.0 percent of all mentions) than did those on the force for a longer period of time (60.3 percent of all mentions).

A comparison of responses to the question about which effects are more important for one-man cars indicated that length of time on the force had little effect on this variable. Seventy-five percent of both groups of officers believed that the negative effects were a more important consideration.

Perceptions of More Foot Patrols

The responses to the question of positive effects of increased foot patrols yield only one important distinction in a comparison of the 2 groups of officers in terms of years on the force. As indicated in Table 17, those officers with less than 6 years on the force mentioned with higher frequency that citizen satisfaction increases when foot patrols increase. (Twenty percent of the total responses focused on this effect compared to 7.8 percent of the total responses from those on the force 6 years or more.) The most frequent mention for both groups (less than 6 years and 6 or more years on the force) referred to better community relations (30.0 percent to 25.0 percent respectively).

When the negative effects of increased foot patrols were considered, there was one wide discrepancy in the perceived effects between the 2 groups of officers. Just over 37.0 percent with less time on the force mentioned decreased mobility compared to 8.7 percent with

Table 17

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING LESS THAN SIX YEARS ON THE FORCE TO SIX OR MORE YEARS ON THE FORCE

	Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Better community relations	6	30.0%	16	25.0%
2) Increased citizen satisfaction	4	20.0	5	7.8
3) More contact with people	3	15.0	9	14.1
4) More effective crime control	3	15.0	9	14.1
5) Increased community awareness	2	10.0	13	20.3
6) More patrol time	1	5.0	0	0.0
7) Higher visibility	0	0.0	7	10.9
8) Other response	1	5.0	5	7.8
Total	20	100.0%	64	100.0%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Slow response time	6	37.5%	16	34.8%
2) Decreased mobility	6	37.5	4	8.7
3) Ineffective crime control	1	6.3	6	13.1
4) Increased expense	1	6.3	3	6.6
5) No negative effects	0	0.0	7	15.2
6) Officer safety	0	0.0	6	13.1
7) Undesirability of foot patrol	0	0.0	2	4.4
8) Other response	2	12.5	1	2.2
9) Don't know	0	0.0	1	2.2
Total	16	100.1%	46	100.3%

more time on the force. The only other significant distinction refers to the fact that those on the force less than 6 years did not make a point of mentioning that there were no negative effects. On the other hand, 15.0 percent of those officers with 6 years or more on the force were of the opinion there were no negative effects of increasing foot patrols.

The responses from the question of which effects (positive or negative) are more important confirmed the above findings. About one half (46.2 percent) of those on the force less than 6 years felt the positive effects are more important. However, 86.0 percent of those on the force 6 years or more felt that the positive effects are more important. Clearly, younger officers that represent the "new breed" were less likely to view foot patrols as having positive effects.

Perceptions of Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

The responses to the question on reduced individual service calls illustrate the problems of using small sample sizes. Although there appeared to be important differences in percentages relating to the portion of Table 18 focusing on negative effects, these percentages were based on 2 responses for officers with less than 6 years on the force and 7 responses for officers with 6 years or more on the force. Thus, the differences in percentages, although substantial, are unreliable.

When the positive effects were compared, the total responses increased to a more suitable level. The one difference worth reporting is that for officers with less than 6 years on the force relatively more responses focused on general positive impacts on police effectiveness

Table 18

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING LESS THAN SIX YEARS ON THE FORCE TO SIX OR MORE YEARS ON THE FORCE

	Less Than Six Years		Six Years or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Positive impact on effectiveness	8	50.0%	16	37.2%
2) More time for crime control	7	43.8	18	41.9
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	1	6.3	6	14.0
4) Positive psychological effects	0	0.0	1	2.3
8) Other response	0	0.0	2	4.6
Total	16	100.1%	43	100.0%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	1	50.0%	5	71.4%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	0	0.0	1	14.3
3) Good public relations	0	0.0	1	14.3
8) Other response	1	50.0	0	0.0
Total	2	100.0%	7	100.0%

(50.0 percent compared to 37.2 percent for those with most time on the force).

The Effects of Officer Rank on Responses to the Three Questions

Perceptions of One-Man Patrol Cars

There was one major difference in the responses of perceived positive effects of one-man cars for patrol and command groups as is shown in Table 19. Officers of patrol rank were more apt to believe that greater police visibility was an important effect of patrolling in one-man cars (16.7 percent of the responses from those of patrol rank compared to 2.9 percent from command-rank officers). Other frequently mentioned patrol-rank responses, such as better coverage, better awareness, and the opinion that there was no effect, corresponded to command-rank responses.

The question of the negative effects of one-man cars also elicited one noticeably different response due to rank; 48.7 percent of all mentions given by patrol-rank officers related to officer safety, whereas 64.1 percent of the command-rank total responses related to officer safety.

When patrol rank and command ranks were compared as to their responses concerning which effects (positive or negative) are more important, a slight difference in opinion appeared. Patrol-rank officers indicated 3 to 1 (75.0 percent to 25.0 percent) that negative effects were more important. Command-rank officers felt nearly the same (76.0 percent negative to 16.0 percent positive) except that 3 officers in the command-rank group were uncertain.

Table 19

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING NONCOMMAND RANK (PATROL) TO COMMAND RANK

	Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Better coverage	7	23.3%	7	20.0%
2) Police visibility increased	5	16.7	1	2.9
3) Better awareness of area	5	16.7	6	17.2
4) No effect	5	16.7	6	17.2
5) More cautious officer	4	13.3	3	8.6
6) Higher productivity	2	6.7	4	11.4
7) More self-reliance	1	3.3	3	8.6
8) Other response	1	3.3	5	14.3
Total	30	100.0%	35	100.2%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Lack of officer safety	19	48.7%	25	64.1%
2) Some calls require two men	7	18.0	5	12.8
3) Lower productivity	6	15.4	4	10.2
4) Boredom	2	5.1	0	0.0
5) Officer confidence decreases	1	2.6	2	5.1
6) No negative effects	1	2.6	0	0.0
7) Constraints relating to such change	0	0.0	1	2.6
8) Other response	3	7.7	2	5.1
Total	39	100.1%	39	99.9%

Perceptions of More Foot Patrols

As can be seen in Table 20, patrol-rank officers, when compared to command-rank officers, mentioned less frequently that a policeman is likely to gain community awareness through increased foot patrols. The responses to the question about positive effects of increased foot patrols showed that 10.8 percent of the patrol-rank mentions related to increased community awareness compared to 23.4 percent of the command-rank mentions. On the other hand, patrol-rank officers were more likely than command-rank officers to believe that effective crime control was a positive effect of foot patrol (18.9 percent to 10.6 percent respectively).

The largest difference in attitudes about the negative effects of foot patrols related to the issue of decreased mobility. One quarter of the patrol-rank officers mentioned decreased mobility as a negative effect, whereas only 8.8 percent of the command-rank officers mentioned the same response as a negative effect. While 14.7 percent of command-rank responses related the opinion that there were no negative effects to foot patrol, only 7.2 percent of patrol-rank responses could be classified this way.

A greater divergence of opinion showed up in the responses to the question of which effects are more important; 68.0 percent of the patrol-rank compared to 84.6 percent of the command-rank officers interviewed responded that positive effects were more important.

In general, the command-rank personnel interviewed felt that increased foot patrol yielded positive effects. Their perceptions of

Table 20

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING NONCOMMAND RANK (PATROL) TO COMMAND RANK

	Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Better community relations	11	29.8%	11	23.4%
2) More effective crime control	7	18.9	5	10.6
3) More contact with people	6	16.2	6	12.8
4) Increased community awareness	4	10.8	11	23.4
5) Increased citizen satisfaction	4	10.8	5	10.6
6) Higher visibility	3	8.1	4	8.5
7) More patrol time	1	2.7	0	0.0
8) Other response	1	2.7	5	10.6
Total	37	100.0%	47	99.9%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Slow response time	10	35.7%	12	35.3%
2) Decreased mobility	7	25.0	3	8.8
3) Ineffective crime control	3	10.7	4	11.8
4) No negative effects	2	7.2	5	14.7
5) Officer safety	2	7.2	4	11.8
6) Increased expense	1	3.6	3	8.8
7) Undesirability of foot patrol	0	0.0	2	5.9
8) Other response	2	7.2	1	3.0
9) Don't know	1	3.6	0	0.0
Total	28	100.2%	34	100.1%

these positive effects were proportionately greater than the perceptions for patrol-rank officers.

Perceptions of Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

Table 21 shows that command-rank officers were more likely to believe that there were positive effects of reduced service calls than were patrol-rank officers. (While 92.5 percent of the command-rank officers responded in a positive manner to this question, 80.8 percent of the patrol-rank officers responded in a positive manner.) Although mentions of positive effects did vary some between the subgroups, there were no important differences in the frequencies of responses. The 2 most frequent responses for both subgroups were more time for crime control (38.5 percent of patrol-rank and 45.5 percent of command-rank) and a general reference to a positive impact on effectiveness (46.2 percent for patrol officers and 36.4 percent for command officers).

The Effects of Education On Responses to the Three Questions

Perceptions of One-Man Patrol Cars

A clear pattern of responses to the question on positive effects of one-man cars did not emerge when the 3 different educational levels were considered. However, there is a group of responses that are important enough to report. As can be seen in Table 22, the fact that an officer had some education led to the likelihood that the officer felt that one-man cars provide better coverage (13.9 percent for no college education, 33.3 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 28.6 percent for an Associate Degree or more).

Table 21

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF THE IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING NONCOMMAND RANK (PATROL) TO COMMAND RANK

	Patrol Rank		Command Rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Positive impact on effectiveness	12	46.2%	12	36.4%
2) More time for crime control	10	38.5	15	45.5
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	4	15.4	3	9.1
4) Positive psychological effects	0	0.0	1	3.0
8) Other response	0	0.0	2	6.1
Total	26	100.1%	33	100.1%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	4	57.2%	2	100.0%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	1	14.3	0	0.0
3) Good public relations	1	14.3	0	0.0
8) Other response	1	14.3	0	0.0
Total	7	100.1%	2	100.0%

Table 22

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING LEVELS OF EDUCATION

	No College Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars						
1) No effect	7	19.4%	3	20.0%	1	7.1%
2) Better awareness of area	6	16.7	1	6.7	4	28.6
3) Better coverage	5	13.9	5	33.3	4	28.6
4) More cautious officer	4	11.1	1	6.7	2	14.3
5) Higher productivity	4	11.1	1	6.7	1	7.1
6) More self-reliance	3	8.3	0	0.0	1	7.1
7) Police visibility increased	2	5.6	3	20.0	1	7.1
8) Other response	5	13.9	1	6.7	0	0.0
Total	36	100.0%	15	100.1%	14	99.8%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars						
1) Lack of officer safety	30	60.0%	9	52.9%	5	45.4%
2) Some calls require two men	8	16.0	2	11.8	2	18.2
3) Lower productivity	7	14.0	1	5.9	2	18.2
4) Constraints relating to such change	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5) Officer confidence decreases	0	0.0	3	17.7	0	0.0
6) No negative effects	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1
7) Boredom	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	9.1
8) Other response	4	8.0	1	5.9	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0%	17	100.1%	11	100.0%

62

When the negative effects of one-man cars were considered, a discernible response pattern emerged. The more education an officer had, the less likely he was to believe that one-man cars are a safety hazard to the officer (60.0 percent for no college education, 53.0 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 45.0 percent for an Associate Degree or more).

A more distinctive pattern of responses developed for the question focusing on which effects are more important. The less education an officer had, the more likely he was to respond that the negative effects of one-man cars were more important than the positive effects. The following response pattern (for positive effects as being more important) occurred: 14.9 percent for no college education, 25.0 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 37.5 percent for more than Associate Degree.

Perceptions of More Foot Patrols

There was a lack of any noticeable trends among responses for the positive effects of more foot patrols when educational levels are considered. However, as can be seen in Table 23, a response pattern did develop for the question of negative effects of more foot patrols. The higher the educational attainment of an officer, the less likely he believed that slow response time was an important negative effect (40.5 percent for no college education, 30.8 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 25.0 percent for more than Associate Degree).

A significant pattern of responses can be discerned when one considers the responses to the question of which effects are more important. In spite of the findings reported in previous paragraphs, the more education an officer had, the less likely that officer was to

Table 23

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING LEVELS OF EDUCATION

	No College Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols						
1) Better community relations	13	25.0%	3	16.7%	6	42.7%
2) Increased community awareness	10	19.2	4	22.2	1	7.1
3) More contact with people	8	15.4	3	16.7	1	7.1
4) More effective crime control	7	13.5	3	16.7	2	14.3
5) Increased citizen satisfaction	5	9.6	3	16.7	1	7.1
6) Higher visibility	5	9.6	0	0.0	2	14.3
7) More patrol time	0	0.0	1	5.6	0	0.0
8) Other response	4	7.7	1	5.6	1	7.1
Total	52	100.0%	18	100.2%	14	99.7%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols						
1) Slow response time	15	40.5%	4	30.8%	3	25.0%
2) No negative effects	6	16.2	1	7.7	0	0.0%
3) Decreased mobility	5	13.5	1	7.7	4	33.3
4) Ineffective crime control	3	8.1	0	0.0	4	33.3
5) Officer safety	3	8.1	3	23.1	0	0.0
6) Undesirability of foot patrol	2	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
7) Increased expense	1	2.7	2	15.4	1	8.3
8) Other response	1	2.7	2	15.4	0	0.0
9) Don't know	1	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	37	99.9%	13	100.1%	12	99.9%

64

believe that the positive effects of foot patrols were more important overall (87.1 percent for no college education, 66.7 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 50.0 percent for more than Associate Degree).

Perceptions of Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

When officers with different educational levels were compared for their responses to this question, a specific pattern developed, as is shown in Table 24. The more education an officer had, the more likely that officer was to be of the opinion that reduced individual service calls would release more time for crime control (39.5 percent for no college education, 45.4 percent for less than Associate Degree, and 50.0 percent for an Associate Degree or more).

Although there appeared to be a response pattern in terms of mentions of negative impacts on effectiveness of reduced service calls, the total number of responses for this category is insufficient to discuss trends with any degree of reliability.

Comparisons among Officers with Different Training Levels

Responses to the questions focusing on the effects of one-man cars and increased foot patrols, as well as the impact on effectiveness of fewer individual service calls, were broken down by the 3 levels of training discussed earlier in this report. Although there were differences in the responses among officers with either low, medium, or high levels of training, there were few trends of any importance across all 3 training levels. In other words, level of training appears to be weakly associated with responses to these 3 questions.

Table 24

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING LEVELS OF EDUCATION

	No College Education		Less Than Associate Degree		Associate Degree or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls						
1) More time for crime control	15	39.5%	5	45.4%	5	50.0%
2) Positive impact on effectiveness	15	39.5	5	45.4	4	40.0
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	5	13.2	1	9.1	1	10.0
4) Positive psychological effects	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
8) Other response	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	38	100.1%	11	99.9%	10	100.0%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls						
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	3	75.0%	2	66.6%	1	50.0%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3) Good public relations	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
8) Other response	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0
Total	4	100.0%	3	99.9%	2	100.0%

99

As can be seen in Tables A-1 through A-3 in Appendix A, one trend across all 3 training levels occurred with respect to reported negative effects of foot patrols. Thus, as training increased, there was less of a tendency for officers to mention increased expense as an undesirable effect (14.3 percent for low training, 5.0 percent with medium training, and 0.0 percent with high training). Another discernible trend occurred with respect to negative effects of one-man patrol cars. The higher the level of training, the greater the tendency to report that lower productivity would be a negative effect (8.0 percent with low training, 13.8 percent with medium training, and 16.7 percent with high training).

Responses to the questions focusing on the relative importance of positive or negative effects of one-man cars or more foot patrols did not yield any trends across the 3 levels of education. This fact is corroborated by the statistics reported in Tables A-4 and A-5 in Appendix A.

Comparisons between Officers Who Lived or Did Not Live in Harrisburg

Perceptions of One-Man Patrol Cars

When the responses to the question of the positive effects of one-man cars were compared between those officers who lived in Harrisburg and those who did not, the major difference was that those officers who did not live in the City were more likely to believe that a better awareness of the area can be gained by one-man car patrols. As Table 25 shows, the comparison was 11.8 percent of the responses for those

Table 25

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING THOSE WHO LIVED IN THE CITY TO THOSE WHO DID NOT LIVE IN THE CITY

	Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Better coverage	4	23.5%	10	20.8%
2) No effect	3	17.7	8	16.7
3) Police visibility increased	2	11.8	4	8.3
4) Better awareness of area	2	11.8	9	18.8
5) More cautious officer	1	5.9	6	12.5
6) Higher productivity	1	5.9	5	10.4
7) More self-reliance	1	5.9	3	6.3
8) Other response	3	17.7	3	6.3
Total	17	100.2%	48	100.1%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars				
1) Lack of officer safety	14	58.3%	30	55.6%
2) Lower productivity	5	20.8	5	9.3
3) Some calls require two men	2	8.3	10	18.5
4) Officer confidence decreases	1	4.2	2	3.7
5) Constraints relating to such change	1	4.2	0	0.0
6) No negative effects	0	0.0	1	1.9
7) Boredom	0	0.0	2	3.7
8) Other response	1	4.2	4	7.4
Total	24	100.0%	54	100.1%

who lived in the City to 18.8 percent of the responses for those who did not live in the City.

When responses to the question focusing on negative effects of one-man cars were examined, two differences emerged. First, those who lived in Harrisburg had a higher frequency of lower productivity responses than those who did not live in the City (20.8 percent who lived in the City to 9.3 percent who did not live in the City). Second, for the response categorized as "some calls requiring two men," 18.5 percent of those who did not live in the City felt that this was an important negative effect of one-man cars, while only 8.3 percent of those who did live in the City responded in a similar manner.

Responses to the question of which effects are more important for one-man cars showed that there was some difference in response between those who lived in the City and those who did not. Eighty percent of the City dwellers were of the opinion that the negative effects bear heaviest on the issue, whereas 73.5 percent of the non-City dwellers were of the same opinion.

Perceptions of More Foot Patrols

As can be seen in Table 26, officers who lived in the City differed from the officers who did not live in the City with regard to positive effects of more foot patrols in 3 ways. First and most significantly, the fact that an officer did not live in the City meant there was a higher likelihood that this officer mentioned foot patrols as an effective way to control crime (3.9 percent who lived in the City to 19.3 percent who did not). Second, those who did live in the City were more likely to mention that increased community awareness was a

Table 26

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING THOSE WHO LIVED IN THE CITY TO THOSE WHO DID NOT LIVE IN THE CITY

	Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harrisburg	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Better community relations	7	26.9%	15	26.3%
2) Increased community awareness	6	23.1	9	15.8
3) More contact with people	5	19.2	7	12.3
4) Higher visibility	4	15.4	3	5.3
5) Increased citizen satisfaction	3	11.5	6	10.5
6) More effective crime control	1	3.9	11	19.3
7) More patrol time	0	0.0	1	1.8
8) Other response	0	0.0	5	8.8
Total	26	100.0%	57	100.1%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols				
1) Slow response time	8	42.1%	14	32.6%
2) No negative effects	3	15.8	4	9.3
3) Ineffective crime control	2	10.5	5	11.6
4) Officer safety	2	10.5	4	9.3
5) Undesirability of foot patrol	2	10.5	0	0.0
6) Increased expense	1	5.2	3	7.0
7) Decreased mobility	0	0.0	10	23.3
8) Other response	1	5.2	2	4.7
9) Don't know	0	0.0	1	2.3
Total	19	99.8%	43	100.1%

positive effect of more foot patrols (23.1 percent who lived in the City to 15.8 percent who did not live in the City). Third, those who lived in the City were more likely to mention high visibility as a positive effect (5.4 percent of responses compared to 5.3 percent for non-City officers).

When the negative effects of more foot patrols were considered, 2 significant differences emerged. The first difference refers to the much greater likelihood of those who lived outside the City to mention that decreased mobility was an important negative effect (0.0 percent of those who lived inside the City to 23.3 percent of those who lived outside the City). The second difference is seen in the higher frequency of mentions that those who lived in the City gave to slower response time (42.1 percent who lived in the City to 32.6 percent who did not live in the City).

The responses to the question of which effects are more important sheds the greatest light on the effects of increased foot patrols. A striking difference emerged when a comparison of the geographic location of the officers' homes was made. Of those who lived in the City, 93.3 percent felt that there were more positive effects to increasing foot patrols, while 69.4 percent of those who lived outside the City felt the same way.

Perceptions of Impacts on Police Effectiveness of Reduced Noncriminal Service Calls

As can be seen in Table 27, the only significant difference in opinions about a reduction of individual service calls between officers who lived in the City and those who did not was that a higher percentage (45.0 percent to 31.6 percent) of those who lived outside the

Table 27

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING THOSE WHO LIVED IN THE CITY TO THOSE WHO DID NOT LIVE IN THE CITY

	Lived in Harrisburg		Did Not Live in Harriburg	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) More time for crime control	9	47.4%	16	40.0%
2) Positive impact on effectiveness	6	31.6	18	45.0
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	3	15.8	4	10.0
4) Positive psychological effects	1	5.3	0	0.0
8) Other response	0	0.0	2	5.0
Total	19	100.1%	40	100.0%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls				
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	2	100.0%	4	57.1%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	0	0.0	1	14.3
3) Good public relations	0	0.0	1	14.3
4) Other response	0	0.0	1	14.3
Total	2	100.0%	7	100.0%

72

City mentioned that there was indeed a positive impact on effectiveness if individual service-type calls were reduced.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Factors Related to Improving Police Productivity

Perhaps the most consistent finding from this survey of the Harrisburg Police Bureau was the high level of concern expressed by officers over the need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy. On a scale from 1 to 10, this factor received an average rating of 8.5 for all officers interviewed. When the sample was broken into different groups of officers, this factor continued to dominate the rankings of all 21 factors presented to each person in the sample.

It should be noted that officers were not asked why this factor, or any other, was important to them. Thus, reasons for selecting this factor cannot be explored. In addition, the statement that was presented to officers implied that current Bureau promotion policy was not fair and equally administered. Respondents by rating this factor highly may have been pointing out the need for a <u>fairer</u> and <u>more</u> equally administered promotion policy.

If the expressed concern for a fair and equally administered promotion policy is viewed more generally as a component of the way relationships among officers in the Bureau are managed, then the <u>additional</u> responses of factors related to police productivity (elicited in unstructured questions) also point to the need to examine carefully the way relationships among personnel are managed. Officers who were interviewed tended spontaneously to mention factors like better communications within the Bureau, better supervision practices, promotion

practices, morale improvements, reducing favoritism, and recognition for superior performance as ways of improving police productivity.

Another important finding was that 2 high-productivity factors related to improved training. "More in-service training for officers" and "More basic training for new recruits" were rated highly by the overall sample and by most groups of officers within the sample. At the same time, however, the factor related to obtaining more formal education, "Taking college courses towards an Associate or Bachelor's Degree," was not rated highly by the officers in the sample. Clearly, training was perceived as being related to productivity improvements, whereas formal education was not.

Two other factors among the 21 presented to all officers received relatively high average ratings. "Better equipment," e.g., radio scramblers, was given an average rating of 7.7 by all officers in the sample; and "Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual services to citizens" was given an even higher average rating--7.8 on a 10-point scale.

At a different point in the questionnaire, officers were asked what impacts on police effectiveness a reduction in services related to noncriminal public order would have. Eighty-five percent of the sample indicated that such a change would increase their effectiveness, a finding which suggests that officers link their effectiveness to criminal-related activities. Thus, officers felt that both the productivity of the Bureau (measured by comparing costs to levels of services), as well as its effectiveness (measured by the impacts of Bureau activities), could be improved by focusing more on the problem of crime.

The fact that officers emphasized concentrating on crime over the provision of individual services also corresponds to findings of several studies that have focused on how police themselves define their duties. Generally, officers in police departments in this country view their mission as one of fighting crime,[4] and not one of providing social services to the public. Since most people hold the police responsible for apprehending suspected criminals, it is not at all surprising that officers in the Harrisburg Bureau would rather spend their time concentrating on the crime problem.

One means of allowing police officers to spend more time fighting crime and yet not reduce the level of noncriminal services is to hire unsworn personnel. The Harrisburg Police officers interviewed were asked to rate the importance of "Greater use of unsworn personnel" as a factor in improving productivity. The resulting average rating was 4.7, one of the lowest given to any of the 21 factors. It would seem that police officers do not perceive substantial benefits from hiring unsworn personnel.

However, evidence exists which points to the fact that police departments that have higher proportions of civilians on their rosters are also more effective in solving crimes that are committed.[5] Thus, although the officers interviewed tended not to emphasize the productivity of hiring more unsworn personnel, their perceptions may have

---

[4]Reference to this fact is made in a recent article by Wesley G. Skogan, "Efficiency and Effectiveness in Big-City Police Departments," Public Administration Review (May-June, 1976), p. 278.

[5]Ibid., p. 282.

been affected by their not wanting unsworn personnel to do any significant portion of their work.

Another set of findings that are important relates to the patrol function of the Police Bureau. In general, the officers that were interviewed did not rank patrol-related productivity factors highly. The exception, "Increasing the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments," was rated among the top 5 factors by officers with street assignments, officers with the highest level of training, and officers with the highest level of education. The only other patrol-related factor that was ranked highly by any group of officers was "Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars," ranked among the top 5 factors by officers with the highest level of education.

On the other hand, "Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols" was rated among the lowest 5 factors by several groups of officers: patrolmen, officers with a street assignment, officers with a medium level of training, officers with post-secondary education, and officers who did not live in Harrisburg. Clearly, many of the policemen interviewed did not feel that foot patrols yield substantial productivity improvements.

It is important to note, however, that when officers in the sample were asked whether the positive or negative effects of foot patrolling were more important, 75.0 percent indicated that the positive effects outweighed the negative effects. Why the apparent discrepancy in these findings? In the productivity section of the questionnaire, an emphasis was placed on costs in relation to levels of service, whereas no such emphasis was stressed in the question regarding effects of foot patrol. Thus, the officers who were interviewed appeared to

react favorably to the idea of foot patrol, but recognized that it is also a very costly way to provide a given level of police patrol.

The reaction to one-man patrol cars was not favorable. In fact, 75.0 percent of those interviewed felt that the negative effects were more important than the positive ones. The main reason offered against this patrol change was that one-man cars were unsafe for the officer involved; of all the reasons offered against this change, 56.4 percent focused on officer safety. Another 4.0 percent of the responses emphasized a reduction of officer confidence.

Clearly, most officers did not want such a change, mainly because it was perceived as exposing them to more hazards. It is important to look at this perception carefully to see if in fact one-man car patrols do result in more officer injuries. Given that York, Pennsylvania, does have one-man cars in many areas, it would be worthwhile investigating the safety record of police officers in that City, as well as examining in detail their patrol strategy.

The Effects of Respondent Characteristics on Perceptions of Productivity Factors

It is worthwhile examining the effects of selected respondent characteristics on perceptions of productivity improvement factors. It is possible to look at the effects of each of the 6 ways of dividing up the sample (patrol versus command, street versus administrative, residence of officers, years on the force, level of training, and level of education). With respect to level of training and level of education, it is worth noting that because officers were asked to recall their training and education experiences over a period of years there may be

a bias in the reported information due to lack of recall of specific training or education experiences.

The residence of officers (whether they lived in Harrisburg or not) affected the ratings of several of the 21 productivity factors. Respondents from the City were more concerned with the problem of waiting in court to give testimony. They rated that factor highly (8.5 average rating), whereas officers from outside the City did not (6.6 average rating).

In terms of low-potential factors, officers living outside the City were substantially less favorable in their rating of the need for more foot patrol (4.6 average rating versus a 7.6 average rating), whereas officers who were Harrisburg residents cited the need for a police union (3.9 average rating versus 5.3 average rating) and more freedom in the use of force (4.7 average rating versus a 5.1 average rating) as having a poor productivity potential.

Officers who had been on the force less than 6 years were more likely to rate "Increase the real patrol time of those given street assignments" highly (8.2 average rating compared to a 6.5 average rating for other officers). Also, they emphasized the need for more basic training for new recruits (8.1 average rating compared to 7.4 average rating for officers on the force 6 years or more).

At the same time, officers with less time on the force rated the need for more foot patrol lower (3.8 average rating) than did other officers (6.0 average rating). Those with more time on the force tended to rate the productivity potential of a police union lower (4.2 average rating compared to a 7.0 average rating from those with less time on the force).

Patrol-rank officers were more likely to rate the need for more basic training highly (7.8 average rating) than were command-rank officers (7.2 average rating). On the other hand, command-rank officers rated ". . . less waiting in court. . ." highly (8.3 average rating), whereas patrolmen did not (5.9 average rating). Command-rank officers also were more concerned with concentrating on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual services (8.1 average rating) than were patrolmen (7.5 average rating).

Patrol-rank officers tended to feel that more foot patrol (5.0 average rating) and reduction of report requirements (4.6 average rating) had a lower productivity potential than did command-rank officers (6.0 average rating for more foot patrol and a 6.1 average rating for reduced report requirements).

Officers with street assignments were more supportive of the idea of increasing the real patrol time of those given street assignments (7.5 average rating compared to a 6.1 average rating for officers with an administrative assignment). Those with an administrative assignment, as did command-rank officers, reacted more favorably to reducing individual services to concentrate more on crime (8.4 average rating) than did street-assigned officers (7.4 average rating).

The need for more foot patrol was rated among the lowest factors by street-assigned officers (4.8 average rating). Officers with an administrative assignment were less negative about this factor (6.6 average rating).

Level of training did not appear to have any marked effects on perceptions of productivity factors. Level of education, on the other hand, did. Officers with at least an Associate Degree emphasized 2

patrol-related factors as having high productivity potential. More real patrol time was given an average rating of 8.1 compared to ratings of 6.4 and 6.8 for those with some college and no college, respectively. More car patrol was given an average rating of 7.9 compared to 6.2 and 5.7 for officers with some and no college, respectively.

On the other hand, officers with some college (less than an Associate Degree) as well as those with at least an Associate Degree did not rate the need for more foot patrol highly (4.8 average rating and 4.1 average rating for these 2 groups, respectively). Those with no college education gave an average rating of 6.2 to this factor.

Officers' Perceptions of How Citizens Would Rate Productivity Factors

When the officers in the sample were asked to take a Harrisburg resident's perspective in ranking the 21 productivity factors, the need for more foot patrol emerged as the most important factor. Sixty percent of those interviewed picked this factor as being among the top 3 from a resident's perspective. It would appear that police officers are aware of the popularity of this patrol technique, given its visibility, and the attendant impression that the police are in neighborhoods to control crime.

Another patrol-related factor, "Increasing the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments," was also rated highly by the police as a factor residents would emphasize. (Twenty-nine percent of the sample ranked this factor as either first, second, or third from a resident's perspective.) This factor was the only one,

however, that was also rated highly by the police themselves (not taking a resident's perspective).

In general, there was a divergence between the perceptions that officers had of various productivity factors and the perceptions they attributed to Harrisburg residents. Police respondents tended to rate the productivity potential of regular citizen feedback as being relatively low, even though they rated this factor highly given a resident's perspective. The lack of congruence between the police and "citizen" perceptions can be attributed in part to the belief that citizens tend not to understand the job of the police; 64.7 percent of the officers interviewed expressed this opinion.

Uses of the Survey Findings

The findings reported in this discussion can be used in at least two related ways:

1. They can be used as a source of information by City officials. The advantage that the information reported in this document has is that it was not filtered through the chain of command in the Bureau. Thus, the biases that might be expected if members of the Bureau solicited opinions on the issues reported herein are minimized.

2. The findings reported here can be viewed as an agenda for discussing changes that need to be made in the Bureau. The emphasis officers placed on the need for a fair promotion policy, for example, needs to be kept in mind if any administrative reorganization is to meet the needs of Bureau personnel. Other findings can be treated in the same way--as a basis for discussing changes that are intended as ways of moving toward a more productive Police Bureau.

It is important to keep in mind that although the survey findings are a reflection of the officers' perceptions of factors that would improve police productivity their perceptions of needed changes may not yield higher productivity levels by themselves. Although most respondents rated the need for a fair and equally administered promotion policy as an important factor, such a change in Bureau policy might result in better morale, but no change in the level of productivity. What may be needed in addition to a different promotion policy is an increased level of training, for example, so that officers have more skills that can be used to make the Bureau productive. Thus, while a promotion policy may improve morale--that is, provide motivations to be more productive--more training or better equipment is needed to convert this motivation to higher levels of outputs.

Officers' perceptions of productivity factors are based on their understanding of police work. High or low ratings for factors should be interpreted as "if. . .then" statements related to police productivity. Thus, a high rating for more basic training can be interpreted as "If new recruits are trained more, then police productivity will improve." Such a statement does not imply that more basic training is bound to improve productivity. Rather it has to be viewed as a hypothesis that merits serious consideration by Bureau administrators.

APPENDIX A

Table A-1

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING LEVELS OF TRAINING

	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of One-Man Cars						
1) No effect	6	33.3%	1	3.9%	4	19.1%
2) Better coverage	5	27.8	5	19.2	4	19.1
3) Better awareness of area	2	11.1	7	26.2	2	9.5
4) Higher productivity	2	11.1	1	3.9	3	14.3
5) Police visibility increased	1	5.6	3	11.5	2	9.5
6) More self-reliance	1	5.6	2	7.7	1	4.8
7) More cautious officer	0	0.0	4	15.4	3	14.3
8) Other response	1	5.6	3	11.5	2	9.5
Total	18	100.1%	26	99.3%	21	100.1%
Negative Effects of One-Man Cars						
1) Lack of officer safety	15	60.0%	14	48.3%	15	62.5%
2) Some calls require two men	3	12.0	6	20.7	3	12.5
3) Lower productivity	2	8.0	4	13.8	4	16.7
4) Officer confidence decreases	2	8.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
5) Boredom	1	4.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
6) Constraints relating to such change	0	0.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
7) No negative effects	0	0.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
8) Other response	2	8.0	1	3.4	2	8.3
Total	25	100.0%	29	99.8%	24	100.0%

Table A-2

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING LEVELS OF TRAINING

	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of More Foot Patrols						
1) Better community relations	5	20.0%	10	31.3%	7	25.9%
2) More contact with people	4	16.0	5	15.6	3	11.1
3) Increased community awareness	4	16.0	4	12.5	7	25.9
4) More effective crime control	4	16.0	5	15.6	3	11.1
5) Higher visibility	2	8.0	3	9.4	2	7.4
6) Increased citizen satisfaction	1	4.0	5	15.6	3	11.1
7) More patrol time	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8) Other response	4	16.0	0	0.0	2	7.4
Total	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	27	99.9%
Negative Effects of More Foot Patrols						
1) Slow response time	6	28.6%	9	45.0%	7	33.3%
2) No negative effects	3	14.3	1	5.0	3	14.3
3) Officer safety	3	14.3	0	0.0	3	14.3
4) Increased expense	3	14.3	1	5.0	0	0.0
5) Decreased mobility	3	14.3	5	25.0	2	9.5
6) Ineffective crime control	2	9.5	2	10.0	3	14.3
7) Undesirability of foot patrol	0	0.0	1	5.0	1	4.8
8) Other response	1	4.8	0	0.0	2	9.5
9) Don't know	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0
Total	21	100.1%	20	100.0%	21	100.0%

Table A-3

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF IMPACTS ON POLICE EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCED NONCRIMINAL INDIVIDUAL SERVICE CALLS COMPARING LEVELS OF TRAINING

	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive Effects of Reduced Service Calls						
1) More time for crime control	9	45.0%	7	35.0%	9	47.4%
2) Positive impact on effectiveness	6	30.0	12	60.0	6	31.6
3) Increased effectiveness, but essential part of services	4	20.0	0	0.0	3	15.8
4) Positive psychological effects	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0
8) Other response	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Total	20	100.0%	20	100.0%	19	100.1%
Negative Effects of Reduced Service Calls						
1) Noncriminal calls are essential	1	50.0%	3	60.0%	2	100.0%
2) Little importance placed on noncriminal calls	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
3) Good public relations	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
8) Other response	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	2	100.0%

Table A-4

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF WHICH EFFECTS ARE MORE IMPORTANT FOR ONE-MAN CARS COMPARING LEVELS OF TRAINING

	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive	3	17.6%	5	31.3%	2	12.5%
Negative	13	76.5	10	62.2	14	87.5
Uncertain	1	5.9	1	6.3	0	0.0
Total	17	100.0%	16	99.8%	16	100.0%

Table A-5

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF WHICH EFFECTS ARE MORE IMPORTANT FOR MORE FOOT PATROLS COMPARING LEVELS OF TRAINING

	Low Level of Training		Medium Level of Training		High Level of Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Positive	8	47.1%	14	77.8%	12	75.0%
Negative	3	17.6	3	16.7	4	25.0
Uncertain	6	35.3	1	5.6	0	0.0
Total	17	100.0%	18	100.1%	16	100.0%

87

APPENDIX B

HARRISBURG POLICE SURVEY

Case No. _____ ____ ____
c.1 c.2

Date _____ Interviewer _____ ____
c.3

Time Started _____ Time Completed _____

Part I

1. Sex 1 ____ Male 2 ____ Female 1. ____
c.4

2. Race 1 ____ White 2 ____ Nonwhite 2. ____
c.5

3. Year of Birth _____ 3. ____ ____
c.6 c.7

4. Marital Status _____ 4. ____
c.8

5. Do you live in Harrisburg? 1 ____ Yes 2 ____ No 5. ____
c.9

(a) If yes, how long? _____ 5a. ____ ____
c.10 c.11

(b) Why or why not? _____ 5b. ____ ____
c.12 c.13

_____ ____ ____
c.14 c.15

_____

6. Rank _____ 6. ____
c.16

7. How long with this Department? _____ 7. ____ ____
c.17 c.18

8. What Division within the Department? _____ 8. ____
c.19

9. Do you have a street-related assignment or an administrative one? _____ 9. ____
c.20

10. How long have you been a police officer? _____ 10. ____ ____
c.21 c.22

11. How long do you expect to be a police officer?

_____ 11. ____ ____
c.23 c.24

12. Training/Education

(a) (1) Kind _____ 12a1. ____
c.25

(2) Where (institution) _____ 12a2. ____ ____
c.26 c.27

(3) When _____ 12a3. ____ ____
c.28 c.29

(4) Credit or Training Hours _____ 12a4. ____ ____
c.30 c.31

____
c.32

(b) (1) Kind _____ 12b1. ____
c.33

(2) Where (institution) _____ 12b2. ____ ____
c.34 c.35

(3) When _____ 12b3. ____ ____
c.36 c.37

(4) Credit or Training Hours _____ 12b4. ____ ____
c.38 c.39

____
c.40

(c) (1) Kind _____ 12c1. ____
c.41

(2) Where (institution) _____ 12c2. ____ ____
c.42 c.43

(3) When _____ 12c3. ____ ____
c.44 c.45

(4) Credit or Training Hours _____ 12c4. ____ ____
c.46 c.47

____
c.48

(d) (1) Kind _____ 12d1. ____ c.49

(2) Where (Institution) _____ 12d2. ____ ____ c.50 c.51

(3) When _____ 12d3. ____ ____ c.52 c.53

(4) Credit or Training Hours _____ 12d4. ____ ____ c.54 c.55

____ c.56

13. What aspects of your work as a police officer do you enjoy the most?

_____ 13. ____ ____ c.57 c.58

_____ ____ ____ c.59 c.60

_____

14. What aspects of your work as a police officer do you enjoy the least?

_____ 14. ____ ____ c.61 c.62

_____ ____ ____ c.63 c.64

_____

15. How would you define a professional police officer?

_____ 15. ____ ____ c.65 c.66

_____ ____ ____ c.67 c.68

_____ ____ ____ c.69 c.70

_____

16. Do you consider the police in your department to be professionals?

1 _____ Yes 2 _____ No 3 _____ Uncertain 16. ____ c.71

9 _____ Don't Know

(a) Explain _____

_____ 16aY. ___ ___ c.72 c.73

_____ 16aY. ___ ___ c.74 c.75

_____ 16aN. ___ ___ c.76 c.77

_____ 16aN. ___ ___ c.78 c.79

___ c.80

Case No. _____ 1. ___ ___ c.1 c.2

17. If citizens perceive themselves as being unsafe from crime in their neighborhood:

(a) What effect, if any, does this have on their activities and their behavior in their neighborhood?

_____ 17a. ___ ___ c.3 c.4

_____ ___ ___ c.5 c.6

(b) What effect, if any, does this have on their behavior towards the police when their household has been victimized?

_____ 17b. ___ ___ c.7 c.8

_____ ___ ___ c.9 c.10

(c) What effect, if any, does this have on their willingness to report crimes to the police?

_____ 17c. ___ ___ c.11 c.12

_____ ___ ___ c.13 c.14

(d) What effect, if any, does this have on their overall evaluation of neighborhood police services?

_____ 17d. ____ ____ c.15 c.16

_____ ____ ____ c.17 c.18

_____

18. To what extent, if any, does a citizen's experiences with crime (being a victim of some criminal activity) affect his or her level of interactions with other Harrisburg residents?

_____ 18. ____ ____ c.19 c.20

_____ ____ ____ c.21 c.22

_____

_____

19. To what extent, if any, do citizens overestimate the crime problem in their neighborhood?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All 19. ____ c.23

5 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know

IF THE ANSWER IS 1 OR 2, then ask:

(a) Why is that? _____ 19a. ____ ____ c.24 c.25

_____ ____ ____ c.26 c.27

_____

_____

20. For neighborhood police services, to what extent, if any, is the level of citizen satisfaction (as revealed by citizen complaints or through surveys of citizens) an appropriate indicator of police effectiveness?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All 20. ____ c.28

5 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know

(a) Why do you think that? _____ 20a. ____ ____
c.29 c.30

_____ ____ ____
c.31 c.32

_____

21. For households that have been victimized by some criminal activity, to what extent, if any, is their level of satisfaction with police services in those situations an appropriate indicator of police effectiveness?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All 21. ____
c.33

5 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know

(a) Why do you think that? _____ 21a. ____ ____
c.34 c.35

_____ ____ ____
c.36 c.37

_____

22. At the present time, which groups, if any, in the City (by age, sex, race, income, or education, for example) have the most say in evaluating your effectiveness as a police officer?

_____ 22. ____ ____
c.38 c.39

_____ ____ ____
c.40 c.41

_____

23. How much say, if any, should the average citizen have in evaluating your effectiveness as a police officer?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ None at All 23. ____
c.42

5 _____ Uncertain 9 Don't Know

24. Which groups, if any, in the City's population (by age, sex, race, income, or education, for example) should have the least amount of say in evaluating your effectiveness as a police officer?

_____ 24. ___ ___ c.43 c.44

_____ ___ ___ c.45 c.46

_____

25. Which groups, if any, in the City's population (by age, sex, race, income, or education, for example) should have the most say in evaluating your effectiveness as a police officer?

_____

_____ 25. ___ ___ c.47 c.48

_____ ___ ___ c.49 c.50

_____

26. The following is a list of individuals or groups in Harrisburg that might have some say in evaluating your effectiveness as a police officer. I would like you to rank these individuals or groups (from 1 to 5) so that a "1" indicates the individual or group having the most say in evaluating your effectiveness at present and a "5" indicates the individual or group having the least amount of say.

26a. ___ c.51

(a) _____ Evaluation by City Council — 26b. ___ c.52

(b) _____ Evaluation by your superiors in the department — 26c. ___ c.53

(c) _____ Evaluation by Harrisburg residents — 26d. ___ c.54

(d) _____ Evaluation by the Mayor

(e) _____ Evaluation by fellow officers of the same rank as yourself — 26e. ___ c.55

27. Now, I would like you to rank these same individuals or groups so that a "1" indicates who should have the most say in evaluating your effectiveness and a "5" indicates who should have the least say in evaluating your effectiveness.

(a) _____ Evaluation by City Council — 27a. _____ c.56

(b) _____ Evaluation by your superiors in the department — 27b. _____ c.57

(c) _____ Evaluation by Harrisburg residents — 27c. _____ c.58

(d) _____ Evaluation by the Mayor — 27d. _____ c.59

(e) _____ Evaluation by fellow officers of the same rank as yourself — 27e. _____ c.60

28. How does the average citizen in Harrisburg view police effectiveness; in other words, how does he judge police effectiveness?

_____ 28. _____ _____ c.61 c.62

_____ _____ _____ c.63 c.64

_____ _____ _____ c.65 c.66

29. Do you think that the citizen's view of effectiveness is an appropriate way to measure police effectiveness?

1 _____ Yes 2 _____ No 3 _____ Uncertain

9 _____ Don't Know — 29. _____ c.67

(a) Why do you think that? _____ 29a. _____ _____ c.68 c.69

_____ _____ _____ c.70 c.71

30. What do you feel would be the effects of having one officer to a patrol car?

(a) In a positive sense - _____ 30a. _____ _____ c.71 c.72

_____ _____ _____ c.73 c.74

(b) In a negative sense - _____ 30b. ____ ____
c.75 c.76

_____ ____ ____
c.77 c.78

_____

(c) Which do you feel is most important?

1 _____ Positive 2 _____ Negative

3 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know 30c. ____
c.79

2
c.80

Case No. _____ ____ ____
c.1 c.2

31. What areas of the City could be patrolled by a one-officer patrol car?

_____

_____ 31. ____ ____
c.3 c.4

_____

32. What do you feel would be the effects of having more foot patrols?

(a) In a positive sense - _____ 32a. ____ ____
c.5 c.6

_____ ____ ____
c.7 c.8

_____

(b) In a negative sense - _____ 32b. ____ ____
c.9 c.10

_____ ____ ____
c.11 c.12

_____

(c) Which do you feel is most important?

1 _____ Positive 2 _____ Negative

3 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know 32c. ____
c.13

33. Would you rate the effectiveness of the intensive patrol efforts in Harrisburg as:

1 _____ Outstanding 2 _____ Good

3 _____ Adequate 4 _____ Inadequate or

5 _____ Very Poor 6 _____ Uncertain

9 _____ Don't Know

33. _____ c.14

(a) Why is this the case? _____

_____

_____

33a. _____ _____ c.15 c.16

_____ _____ c.17 c.18

34. If less police time were spent providing services that relate to noncriminal public order, for example, rescuing pets and controlling domestic arguments, what impact, if any, would this have on police effectiveness?

_____

_____

_____

_____

34. _____ _____ c.19 c.20

_____ _____ c.21 c.22

35. As far as police services are concerned, do you believe that Harrisburg and surrounding communities should be combined so that there is one police department for the area?

1 _____ Yes 2 _____ No 3 _____ Uncertain

4 _____ Don't Know 9 _____ No Response

35. _____ c.23

(a) If Yes: What do you think would be an appropriate area for one police force? Harrisburg and:

1 _____ West Shore 2 _____ Penbrook

3 _____ Paxtang 4 _____ Steelton

5 _____ Susquehanna Township

8 _____ Other _____

35a. _____ _____ c.24 c.25

(b) Why? _____ 35bY. ___ ___ c.26 c.27

_____ 35bY. ___ ___ c.28 c.29

_____ 35bN. ___ ___ c.30 c.31

35bN. ___ ___ c.32 c.33

Now I would like to turn to some questions concerning police involvement in criminal victimizations incidents in Harrisburg.

36. How often, in percentages, do citizens call the police when they or members of their household have had the following types of crimes committed against them?

	Scale of 0 to 100%			
Part I Person Crimes	0	50	100	
(a) Murder and Manslaughter	I I I I I I I I I I I			36Ia. ___ ___ c.34 c.35
(b) Aggravated Assault	I I I I I I I I I I I			36Ib. ___ ___ c.36 c.37
(c) Robbery	I I I I I I I I I I I			36Ic. ___ ___ c.38 c.39
Part I Property Crimes	0	50	100	
(d) Burglaries	I I I I I I I I I I I			36Id. ___ ___ c.40 c.41
(e) Grand Larceny & Theft	I I I I I I I I I I I			36Ie. ___ ___ c.42 c.43
(f) Auto Theft	I I I I I I I I I I I			36If. ___ ___ c.44 c.45
Part II Lesser Offenses	0	50	100	
(a) Simple Assault	I I I I I I I I I I I			36IIa. ___ ___ c.46 c.47
(b) Petty Larceny	I I I I I I I I I I I			36IIb. ___ ___ c.48 c.49
(c) Vandalism	I I I I I I I I I I I			36IIc. ___ ___ c.50 c.51

37. What are important reasons why police are not called for the following offenses?

Part I Person Crimes

(a) Murder and Manslaughter - _____ 37Ia. ____ ____ c.52 c.53

_____ ____ ____ c.54 c.55

_____

(b) Aggravated Assault - _____ 37Ib. ____ ____ c.56 c.57

_____ ____ ____ c.58 c.59

_____

(c) Robbery - _____ 37Ic. ____ ____ c.60 c.61

_____ ____ ____ c.62 c.63

_____

Part I Property Crimes

(d) Burglaries - _____ 37Id. ____ ____ c.64 c.65

_____ ____ ____ c.66 c.67

_____

(e) Grand Larceny and Theft - _____ 37Ie. ____ ____ c.68 c.69

_____ ____ ____ c.70 c.71

_____

(f) Auto Theft - _____ 37If. ____ ____ c.72 c.73

_____ ____ ____ c.74 c.75

_____

Part II Lesser Offenses

(a) Simple Assault - _____ 37IIa. ____ ____ c.76 c.77

_____ ____ ____ c.78 c.79

_____

3 c.80

Case No. _____ c.1 c.2

(b) Petty Larceny - _____ 371lb. c.3 c.4

_____ c.5 c.6

(c) Vandalism - _____ 371lc. c.7 c.8

_____ c.9 c.10

38. When you first arrive on the scene of a crime, what limitations, if any, do you usually experience that tend to prevent you from performing your duty in the most effective manner?

(a) As related to Part I Person Crimes - _____ 38a. c.11 c.12

_____ c.13 c.14

(b) As related to Part I Property Crimes - _____ 38b. c.15 c.16

_____ c.17 c.18

(c) As related to Part II Lesser Offenses - _____ 38c. c.19 c.20

_____ c.21 c.22

39. Concerning the on-the-scene investigation, what aspects of your activities are most likely to satisfy citizens with your performance? (NOTE: Probe for as much detail as possible)

(a) As related to Part I Person Crimes - _____

_____ 39a. c.23 c.24

_____ c.25 c.26

(b) As related to Part I Property Crimes - _____

_____ 39b. ____ ____
c.27 c.28

_____ ____ ____
c.29 c.30

_____

(c) As related to Part II Lesser Offenses - _____

_____ 39c. ____ ____
c.31 c.32

_____ ____ ____
c.33 c.34

_____

Now I would like to ask you several questions concerning the issue of cooperation between Harrisburg residents and the police.

40. Which groups in Harrisburg (by age, sex, race, income, or education, for example) tend to cooperate <u>least</u> with the police?

_____ 40. ____ ____
c.35 c.36

_____ ____ ____
c.37 c.38

_____

41. Which groups tend to cooperate <u>most</u> with the police?

_____ 41. ____ ____
c.39 c.40

_____ ____ ____
c.41 c.42

_____

42. How much of an effect, if any, does the level of cooperation that police get from Harrisburg residents have on the effectiveness of the police?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ None at All

5 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know

42. ____
c.43

43. In what specific ways, if any, does a high level of citizen cooperation with the police make it easier for the police to be effective?

43. c.41 c.45

_____ c.46 c.47

_____ c.48 c.49

_____

44. In what specific ways, if any, does a low level of citizen cooperation with the police make it harder for the police to be effective?

44. c.50 c.51

_____ c.52 c.53

_____ c.54 c.55

_____

45. If the average citizen is not satisfied with his police services, what effects, if any, does that have on his willingness to cooperate with the police?

45. c.56 c.57

_____ c.58 c.59

_____ c.60 c.61

_____

46. Compared to citizens who are not satisfied with their police services, how much more are citizens who <u>are</u> satisfied with police services likely to cooperate with the police?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All

5 _____ Uncertain 9 _____ Don't Know

46. c.62

47. What steps, if any, could be taken to improve the level of cooperation Harrisburg police get from residents?

47. c.63 c.64

_____ c.65 c.66

_____ c.67 c.68

_____

Part II (To be completed by the officer interviewed)

Please select the response that most closely represents your reaction to each question or statement. Do not concern yourself with the question numbers and blanks to the right of each question; they will be utilized by Institute staff to code your responses.

48. Harrisburg is a good place in which to raise children.

1 _____ Strongly Agree 2 _____ Agree

3 _____ Neutral 4 _____ Disagree

5 _____ Strongly Disagree

48. _____ c.69

49. A person is safe from crime in Harrisburg.

1 _____ Strongly Agree 2 _____ Agree

3 _____ Neutral 4 _____ Disagree

5 _____ Strongly Disagree

49. _____ c.70

50. How well do citizens in this community understand the job of the police?

1 _____ Very Well 2 _____ Fairly Well

3 _____ Not too Well 4 _____ Not at All

50. _____ c.71

51. Would you rate the quality of police service provided by your department to neighborhood residents as:

1 _____ Outstanding 2 _____ Good

3 _____ Adequate 4 _____ Inadequate or

5 _____ Very Poor ?

51. _____ c.72

52. What rating do you think citizens give the job the police are doing in their neighborhoods?

1 _____ Outstanding 2 _____ Good

3 _____ Adequate 4 _____ Inadequate

5 _____ Very Poor

52. _____ c.73

53. Would you rate the cooperation of the District Attorney's Office with the police as:

1 _____ Outstanding 2 _____ Good

3 _____ Adequate 4 _____ Inadequate or

5 _____ Very Poor ?

53. _____ c.74

54. To what extent, if any, do sentences handed out by judges in Dauphin County act as deterrents to crime?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All

54. _____ c.75

55. Is crime in Harrisburg in the last two years:

1 _____ Increasing 2 _____ Staying about the same

or 3 _____ Decreasing?

55. _____ c.76

56. To what extent, if any, would crime be reduced if people became more involved in reporting crime?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All

56. _____ c.77

57. To what extent, if any, does a citizen's not wanting to become involved affect your desire to apprehend the perpetrator of a crime?

1 _____ A Great Deal 2 _____ Some

3 _____ Very Little 4 _____ Not at All

57. _____ c.78

_____ c.79

4 c.80

Case No. _____

_____ c.1 _____ c.2

The next several questions are focused on the issue of police productivity. You may have your own idea of what police productivity means; but in answering the following questions, please think of productivity as being the level of police service your department provides as compared to the total cost of providing that level of services.

Improvements in productivity could therefore take the two following forms:

(1) Maintaining the current level of services at a reduced cost.

(2) Improving the current level of services for the same cost.

58. On a scale from 1 to 10, judge each of the following factors as to their potential for increasing police productivity. A rating of "1" would mean that a factor has hardly any potential, a rating of "5" means it is of average potential, and a rating of "10" means that a factor has a very high potential.

		58.	59.	60.	61.
(a) ____	Higher salaries	(a) ____ ____ c.3 c.4	(a) ____ c.51	(a) ____ c.75	(a) ____ c.22
(b) ____	Less emphasis on probable cause	(b) ____ ____ c.5 c.6	(b) ____ c.52	(b) ____ c.76	(b) ____ c.23
(c) ____	Fewer restrictions on the use of force	(c) ____ ____ c.7 c.8	(c) ____ c.53	(c) ____ c.77	(c) ____ c.24
(d) ____	Better equipment; e.g., radio scramblers	(d) ____ ____ c.9 c.10	(d) ____ c.54	(d) ____ c.78	(d) ____ c.25
(e) ____	Fair and equally administered promotion policies	(e) ____ ____ c.11 c.12	(e) ____ c.55	(e) ____ c.79	(e) ____ c.26
(f) ____	Unionization of police	(f) ____ ____ c.13 c.14	(f) ____ c.56	(f) ____ c.3	(f) ____ c.27
(g) ____	Less waiting in court to give testimony	(g) ____ ____ c.15 c.16	(g) ____ c.57	(g) ____ c.4	(g) ____ c.28
(h) ____	Reduce report requirements	(h) ____ ____ c.17 c.18	(h) ____ c.58	(h) ____ c.5	(h) ____ c.29
(i) ____	Precise guidelines for handling cases	(i) ____ ____ c.19 c.20	(i) ____ c.59	(i) ____ c.6	(i) ____ c.30

		58.	59.	60.	61.
(j) ____	Less direct supervision by superiors	(j) ____ ____ c.21 c.22	(j) ____ c.60	(j) ____ c.7	(j) ____ c.31
(k) ____	Permanent team (district) assignments	(k) ____ ____ c.23 c.24	(k) ____ c.61	(k) ____ c.8	(k) ____ c.32
(l) ____	More basic training required for new recruits	(l) ____ ____ c.25 c.26	(l) ____ c.62	(l) ____ c.9	(l) ____ c.33
(m) ____	More in-service training for officers	(m) ____ ____ c.27 c.28	(m) ____ c.63	(m) ____ c.10	(m) ____ c.34
(n) ____	Greater proportion of the Department on foot patrols	(n) ____ ____ c.29 c.30	(n) ____ c.64	(n) ____ c.11	(n) ____ c.35
(o) ____	Concentrating more on the problem of crime and less on the provision of individual citizen services	(o) ____ ____ c.31 c.32	(o) ____ c.65	(o) ____ c.12	(o) ____ c.36
(p) ____	Taking college courses towards an Associate or Bachelor's Degree	(p) ____ ____ c.33 c.34	(p) ____ c.66	(p) ____ c.13	(p) ____ c.37
(q) ____	Getting regular feedback from City residents on the job the police are doing	(q) ____ ____ c.35 c.36	(q) ____ c.67	(q) ____ c.14	(q) ____ c.38
(r) ____	Greater proportion of the Department patrolling in cars	(r) ____ ____ c.37 c.38	(r) ____ c.68	(r) ____ c.15	(r) ____ c.39
(s) ____	Increase the real patrol time of those who are given street assignments	(s) ____ ____ c.39 c.40	(s) ____ c.69	(s) ____ c.16	(s) ____ c.40

		58.	59.	60.	61.
(t) _____	Greater use of unsworn personnel	(t) ___ ___ c.41 c.42	(t) ___ c.70	(t) ___ c.17	(t) ___ c.41
(u) _____	Misdemeanor summons in lieu of physical arrest and incarceration.	(u) ___ ___ c.43 c.44	(u) ___ c.71	(u) ___ c.18	(u) ___ c.42

What other factors, if any, relate to police productivity? (Open-ended Codes)

(v) _____	(v) ___ ___ c.45 c.46	(v) ___ c.72	(v) ___ c.19	(v) ___ c.43
(w) _____	(w) ___ ___ c.47 c.48	(w) ___ c.73	(w) ___ c.20	(w) ___ c.44
(x) _____	(x) ___ ___ c.49 c.50	(x) ___ c.74	(x) ___ c.21	(x) ___ c.45

59. Rank the factors from the above list (including factors you listed, if appropriate) which deserve immediate attention.

(1) _____ 591. ____ ____ c.46 c.47

(2) _____ 592. ____ ____ c.48 c.49

(3) _____ 593. ____ ____ c.50 c.51

(4) _____ 594. ____ ____ c.52 c.53

60. Rank the factors which are <u>least</u> critical to increasing productivity.

(1) _____ 601. ____ ____ c.54 c.55

(2) _____ 602. ____ ____ c.56 c.57

(3) _____ 603. ____ ____ c.58 c.59

(4) _____ 604. ____ ____ c.60 c.61

61. Rank the factors you think the average citizen in Harrisburg would consider to be important in increasing police productivity.

(1) _____ 611. ____ ____ c.62 c.63

(2) _____ 612. ____ ____ c.64 c.65

(3) _____ 613. ____ ____ c.66 c.67

62. For each of the following three types of crime, rank from most important (1) to least important (5) police activities that you feel are important in achieving a high level of police effectiveness.

1a. Person Crimes of a serious nature:

____ Adequate response time 621a. ____ c.68

____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred) ____ c.69

(Note: Please turn to the top of the next page for the rest of 62la.)

_____ Whether an arrest was made _____ c.70

_____ The on-the-scene investigation _____ c.71

_____ Whether the suspects were convicted in court _____ c.72

Ib. Property crimes of a serious nature:

_____ Adequate response time 62Ib. _____ c.73

_____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred) _____ c.74

_____ Whether an arrest was made _____ c.75

_____ The on-the-scene investigation _____ c.76

_____ Whether the suspects were convicted in court _____ c.77

_____ c.78 _____ c.79

6 c.80

Case No. _____ _____ c.1 _____ c.2

II. Crimes of a less serious nature:

_____ Adequate response time 62II. _____ c.3

_____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred) _____ c.4

_____ Whether an arrest was made _____ c.5

_____ The on-the-scene investigation _____ c.6

_____ Whether the suspects were convicted in court _____ c.7

63. For each of the following three types of crime, rank police activities that are most important in achieving a high level of citizen satisfaction.

Ia. Person crimes of a serious nature:

_____ Adequate response time	63Ia.	_____ c.8
_____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred)		_____ c.9
_____ Whether an arrest was made		_____ c.10
_____ The on-the-scene investigation		_____ c.11
_____ Whether suspect(s) were convicted in court		_____ c.12

Ib. Property crimes of a serious nature:

_____ Adequate response time	63Ib.	_____ c.13
_____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred)		_____ c.14
_____ Whether an arrest was made		_____ c.15
_____ The on-the-scene investigation		_____ c.16
_____ Whether suspect(s) were convicted in court		_____ c.17

II. Crimes of a less serious nature:

_____ Adequate response time	63II.	_____ c.18
_____ Follow-up investigation (where it occurred)		_____ c.19
_____ Whether an arrest was made		_____ c.20
_____ The on-the-scene investigation		_____ c.21
_____ Whether suspect(s) were convicted in court		_____ c.22

64. What is the frequency of follow-up (in percentages) for the following types of crimes?

Ia. Person Crimes

_____ Murder and Manslaughter	64Ia.	c.23 c.24
_____ Aggravated Assault		c.25 c.26
_____ Robbery		c.27 c.28

Ib. Property Crimes

_____ Burglary	64Ib.	c.29 c.30
_____ Grand Larceny or Theft		c.31 c.32
_____ Auto Theft		c.33 c.34

II. Lesser Offenses

_____ Simple Assault	64II.	c.35 c.36
_____ Petty Larceny		c.37 c.38
_____ Vandalism		c.39 c.40

65. Did you rate the productivity factors in question 58 as to your own understanding of productivity or to the definition described in the paragraph prior to question 58?

1 _____ My Own Understanding

2 _____ As Described in Paragraph — 65. c.41

(a) Explain: _____ _____ — 65a. c.42 c.43

_____ _____ c.44 c.45

_____ _____ c.46 c.47

7 c.80